The QUARTERLY JOURNAL *of* SPEECH

VOLUME XLI DECEMBER 1955 NUMBER 4

THE FIRST ORGANIZED REVOLT AGAINST THE THEATRICAL SYNDICATE

Monroe Lippman

WHEN Marc Klaw, A. L. Erlanger, Charles Frohman, Al Hayman, J. Frederick Zimmerman, and Samuel Nixon met one day in 1896 for the purpose of discussing the state of the American theatre, a great trust was born. In the hands of these six men rested either outright ownership or booking control of over 500 theatres, spanning the width and breadth of the country. Included among these theatres were not only the important houses in most of America's major cities, but also the leading theatres in the key cities on any road tour an acting company might wish to make.

When these men organized the Theatrical Syndicate shortly after their first meeting, it was with the definite intention of establishing a monopolistic control of the first-class theatres in this country. This is clearly evident from the articles of agreement,[1] one of whose major provisions was that all theatres controlled by the Syndicate members were to be booked "in conjunction with one another." This meant simply that no production would be allowed to appear in a Syndicate theatre which appeared in any other theatre, except by the Syndicate's written consent. Since the members of the Syndicate had no intention of granting such consent, except perhaps in cities where there was no Syndicate theatre, it is obvious that the organization intended to do all the booking for its clients, or none of it. In other words, any production which wished to appear in Syndicate theatres could do so only by agreeing to appear in them exclusively.

The Syndicate's quick success in gaining a virtual monopoly was due to its control of the strategically located theatres. Under the circumstances a touring company had little choice but to go to the Syndicate for its bookings, and to agree to appear exclusively in Syndicate houses. With the better companies thus booked exclusively in Syndicate theatres, it became necessary for managers of independent theatres on almost any route to apply to the Syndicate for attractions. The Syndicate, quick to press its advantage, agreed to book such independent theatres only if their managers would agree to book Syndicate at-

Monroe Lippman (Ph.D., Michigan, 1937), Professor of Theatre and Speech and Head of his Department at Tulane University, is at present holding a Guggenheim Fellowship for historical studies of American plays of protest.

[1] A copy of the complete agreement appears in the *New York Dramatic Mirror* (March 26, 1898), 3-6.

tractions exclusively. Since most of the desirable attractions were under the Syndicate's control, independent managers were glad to accept the organization's terms. Thus, borrowing the idea of trusts from the industrial world around it, the Syndicate succeeded in establishing control of the American theatre in a surprisingly short time. Aiding them in their attempt was the fact that rapid expansion of the country had thrown theatrical booking into a state of chaos, and the creation of a well-organized group such as the Syndicate promised to bring order out of the chaos.

Since the articles of agreement under which the Syndicate was formed so clearly reveal the organization's monopolistic intent, there has been some curiosity as to why there was not an immediate organized protest on the part of leading actors, producers, and managers. It is obvious that a monopoly such as that which the Syndicate sought to establish would enable it not only to dictate the policies of all theatres under its control, but also to govern the professional lives of actors, producers, and managers. It is also extremely probable that a repudiation or boycott of the Syndicate by the most important theatrical professionals, at a time when the organization was first attempting to secure exclusive booking privileges, would have killed the trust, or at least crippled it badly, for it could not have hoped to succeed if the popular actors and producers of the time had refused to play in Syndicate houses. Had the leaders done so, independent managers would not have been willing to relinquish their independence despite the uncertainty of booking conditions, for they then could have anticipated that their theatres would be regularly supplied with first-class attractions.

Looking back with the wisdom gained from the hindsight of several decades, all this is readily apparent. However, at the time there were understandable reasons why there was no immediate organized protest. Most important of these reasons was the fact that the terms of the Syndicate's pact were not known outside the membership of the organization. The Syndicate members were shrewd men, wise in the ways of actors, and worked swiftly and quietly because they realized they must become firmly established before allowing the important players to gain full knowledge of their plan. Consequently, they avoided publicity on the terms of their agreement and made no immediate overtures to any of the leading actors, being content to wait until they had solidified their control of theatres. It was not until some twenty months after the Syndicate's inception, when the agreement was introduced as evidence in a lawsuit, that its exact terms became publicly known.

Another reason there was no great early concern was that the important stars felt secure in their large and faithful public followings. They had been accustomed to playing in whatever theatres they chose, making their arrangements directly with the managers of the theatres or their personal agents. They had been enjoying successful tours and had grown smug in the belief that they were so firmly established that nothing could interfere with their success as long as they continued to please their audiences. There was little reason for them to believe differently, for such players as Joseph Jefferson, Nat Goodwin, James O'Neill, Francis Wilson, and many others had always attracted large, friendly audiences wherever they appeared. Why, then, should they worry about a small group of commercially minded managers who had never shown any great interest

in the theatre except for certain of its business aspects?

Of all the important actors and managers, the only one who seemed to sense the full intent of the Syndicate and the danger that might result was Harrison Grey Fiske, husband-manager of Minnie Maddern Fiske, and publisher of the widely read and highly respected theatrical publication, the *New York Dramatic Mirror*. In a conversation with Al Hayman sometime during the interim between the Syndicate members' first meeting and the actual formation of the trust on August 31, 1896, Fiske had heard enough to make him highly suspicious of the organization's intentions. He fought the Syndicate from the start, but proceeded rather cautiously at first, becoming more and more outspoken as his suspicions were confirmed. As he grew increasingly belligerent, the members of the Syndicate began to realize that Fiske's open fight against them could well lead to general antagonism on the part of many of the leading actors, thereby defeating the organization's purposes before it could get well started. They therefore were anxious to avoid a definite breach with Fiske, not only because he was an eminent producer but more especially because, as publisher of the *Mirror*, he wielded great influence in the theatrical profession.

The Syndicate's first reaction was to approach Fiske diplomatically. By offering him assurances that his fears were highly exaggerated, they tried to persuade him to silence. But all efforts at appeasement were in vain. Every attempt made by the Syndicate to win Fiske over, and every veiled threat made to quiet him, were publicized through the columns of the *Mirror*, with the result that the Syndicate was receiving much more unfavorable publicity than it had anticipated so early.

Finally, after the Syndicate had been organized for more than a year, during which time Fiske managed to collect a great deal of information about it, there began the publication of a four-page supplement to the *Mirror*, called the "Theatrical Trust Supplement" and devoted entirely to exposing and condemning the intentions and growth of the Syndicate. The first supplement appeared on November 13, 1897, and was followed by fourteen others, appearing at intervals of one or two weeks. With the appearance of the Supplement the Syndicate members felt that they could no longer afford to remain quiet and had no alternative but to start a campaign of retaliation. The first step in this campaign came on November 19, when they somewhat reluctantly brought a libel suit against Fiske. Having thus been forced into a counterattack, the Syndicate waged an intensive battle. The firm of Frohman and Hayman withdrew its advertising from the *Mirror*. The firm of Klaw and Erlanger, which acted as booking agent for the entire Syndicate, threatened to refuse to book any company that advertised in the Fiske publication. The firm of Nixon and Zimmerman, which controlled the first-class theatres in Philadelphia, tried to keep the *Mirror* out of that city by denying the newspaper stands in the leading hotels permission to sell tickets for their theatres, unless they gave up selling the *Mirror*.

The Syndicate failed in all these attempts to stop the flood of unfavorable publicity it had been getting through the *Mirror*, simply because Fiske refused to be intimidated. For twenty-one months he had been pecking away at the trust, hoping to flush out into the open its real intentions. Now that the opportunity had presented itself, he joined battle with exuberance. When Frohman and Hayman withdrew their advertising, Fiske gave their act wide

publicity, implying strongly that his accusations must be true to draw such a positive act of retaliation. When Klaw and Erlanger threatened to refuse to book companies advertising in the *Mirror*, Fiske slanted his stories on this threat in such a way as to make Klaw and Erlanger appear to be despots. When Nixon and Zimmerman banned the *Mirror* from Philadelphia hotel stands by threatening to withdraw the privilege of selling tickets to their theatres, Fiske jubilantly published reports of the more than proportionate increase in sales in newspaper stands located near these hotels. When the Syndicate brought suit against Fiske for libel, Fiske openly welcomed the suit, for he felt that at long last the actual provisions of the Syndicate's signed agreement would be brought to light, and thus other producers, managers, and actors would be forced to a realization of their peril.

The members of the Syndicate also appreciated the possible consequences of allowing the terms of their pact to be made public, and during the libel suit did everything they could to prevent the original agreement from being introduced in court. Fiske contended, not without justification, that the agreement was the major issue in the lawsuit, and finally, at the insistence of the court, it was introduced as evidence. Fiske was elated over this long-sought opportunity to expose the terms of the agreement, and on March 26, 1898, the entire document was published in the pages of the *Mirror*. Thus for the first time, over a year and a half after the agreement had gone into effect, its details were revealed to the public.

Realizing that further publicity could only be harmful to it, the Syndicate now expressed its willingness to discontinue the suit. Fiske, however, was enjoying the advantage he had gained by the disclosure of the Syndicate's agreement and was unwilling to let the suit drop; but the members of the Syndicate let the case drag until finally, at their request as plaintiffs, it was discontinued on April 18, 1900, nearly two and a half years after it had been begun. Having been defeated in their effort to squelch Fiske, the Syndicate members were now anxious to avoid any further publicity on the dismissal of the case and asked Fiske not to publicize it, arguing that the dismissal itself served as complete vindication for him. Fiske, however, was not as interested in personal vindication as he was in exposing and killing the Syndicate's intended monopoly, so he not only published the story of the dismissal but took the opportunity to review the entire case and call attention once more to the dangers of the Syndicate's bid for power.[2]

Fiske's fight against the Syndicate, and the constant publicity he gave it through the *Mirror*, eventually had the effect for which he had hoped. Once the Syndicate's plans had been made public, the *Mirror's* fight was taken up by newspapers all over the country, and leading players and managers began to appreciate the possible eventualities of such an organization. Nat Goodwin, Francis Wilson, Richard Mansfield, and others finally realized the dangers to their own careers and at last were ready to organize in competition to the Syndicate. As is not infrequently the case in the theatre when credits are involved, there is some conflict of opinion as to who conceived the notion of organizing a resistance movement to the Syndicate. Goodwin later claimed to have originated the idea,[3] while M. B.

[2] See "The Theatrical Trust's Libel Suit Against 'The Mirror' Discontinued," *New York Dramatic Mirror* (May 5, 1900), 8-9; also "Discontinued," *ibid.*, p. 14.

[3] See *Nat Goodwin's Book* (Boston, 1914), p. 106.

Leavitt, a prominent manager of the late nineteenth century, has credited the notion to Jacob Greenwall, a New Orleans theatrical manager.[4] However, the real instigator of the revolt was unquestionably Harrison Grey Fiske, who had fought and exposed the Syndicate long before anyone else in the profession had ever realized its intentions.

Once aroused, the actors took up the fight with zest. Richard Mansfield and Francis Wilson made numerous vitriolic curtain speeches, denouncing the Syndicate in no uncertain terms, and the former also spoke before various clubs, losing no opportunity to impugn the organization. Others who finally came out in public opposition to the Syndicate were Fanny Davenport, James O'Neill, William H. Crane, and A. M. Palmer. Two other popular stars, Joseph Jefferson and James A. Herne, also disapproved of the trust but were less vociferous in their opposition.

Early in 1898, in all probability as a consequence of the courtroom disclosure of the Syndicate's agreement, the actors' rebellion was furthered by an organization of seven popular stars, who signed a pact which would almost certainly have resulted in breaking the Syndicate's monopoly, if its signatories had stayed united. Goodwin, Wilson, O'Neill, Herne, Mansfield, Fanny Davenport, and Mrs. Fiske were all parties to this agreement, which was to remain in effect through 1899. Under its terms, none of the signers was permitted to book through an agency of any kind, on penalty of a five thousand dollar forfeit. They could play in any theatres they wished but must book either directly with the manager of the theatre or through the executive committee of the newly-formed organization. This meant simply that the signers were permitted to appear in Syndicate theatres if they chose, but were not permitted to book their productions through Klaw and Erlanger, the Syndicate's booking agency. Since the Syndicate agreement provided that Klaw and Erlanger were to do all the booking for Syndicate theatres, the effect of the rebelling actors' agreement was to bar them from playing in those theatres.

News of the organized rebellion was hailed by newspapers and many theatrical figures as a blow for artistic freedom, and there was a great deal of impressive rhetoric and oratory about the preservation of culture, the maintenance of artistic standards, and the evils of monopoly. A large share of the oratory emanated from some of the signers of the pact who, later developments force one to suspect, were at least as concerned with the theatricality of the battle as they were with the principles involved. Had they been more sincerely concerned with these principles, their chances for success would have been excellent, for the Syndicate needed them, since it could not have succeeded with an appreciable number of important stars remaining outside its control. These players had large public followings and in all probability would have retained the patronage of their followers if they had remained united in their opposition to the Syndicate, even if they had been forced to appear in theatres which had not previously been regarded as first-class houses. Furthermore, had they stuck by their principles, other less venturesome actors doubtless would have joined them. And had managers of Syndicate theatres thus been unable to present the productions of these popular stars, they would very soon have been forced to give up their agreement, for they would have lacked the patronage to make it a profitable one. However,

[4] *Fifty Years in Theatrical Management* (New York, 1912), p. 565

the sad truth soon became apparent that in spite of the idealistic speeches made by some of the actors opposing the Syndicate, and in spite of their professed defense of art, most of them were much more alarmed about the danger to their financial well-being than they were about the evils of monopoly in art. One by one they all went over to the Syndicate, with the notable exception of Mrs. Fiske.

Nat Goodwin has accused Joseph Jefferson of being the first to desert the actors' cause.[5] There is little justice in the charge, however, for Jefferson had not signed the agreement. Furthermore, Jefferson did not ally himself with the Syndicate entirely. True, he did appear in Syndicate theatres, but he also appeared in independent theatres. Because he was so universally popular, and because he was at the time the dean of the acting profession, the Syndicate members were shrewd enough to welcome him into their theatres even though he also appeared in what they termed "opposition theatres." James A. Herne, like Jefferson, was also welcomed by the Syndicate, although, unlike Jefferson, he had actually been a signatory to the agreement. He did not completely relinquish his independence, however, by agreeing to play in Syndicate theatres, for he, too, was permitted to play in independent houses whenever he wished.

Herne and Jefferson had had long and honorable careers in the theatre, and were so firmly established and so highly regarded by all, that in their cases the members of the Syndicate could well afford to relax the strict provisions of their agreement. This did not mean, however, that they had any inclination similarly to relax these provisions for the others. Instead, they shrewdly appealed to the remaining opponents by offering them more than they had ever been offered before. With these offers they won over most of them, and those they failed to win over were blacklisted and thus eventually forced into line—all but Mrs. Fiske.

Mansfield, who had been most energetic in his opposition to the Syndicate, was one of the first to go over to it. In July, 1898, just a very short time after the actors' agreement had been signed, he decided that the Syndicate members had conceded so much to him that it was no longer worth while to fight them, principle to the contrary notwithstanding. Because Mansfield had been particularly active in the fight against the Syndicate, his abrupt change of attitude was a distinct blow to the others in the agreement. Even now, however, he did not always play in Syndicate theatres. Occasionally he appeared in an independent house, presumably with the consent of the Syndicate; but the great majority of his appearances after July, 1898, were made in theatres controlled by the Syndicate.

O'Neill soon went under the management of George C. Tyler, who, while not a member of the Syndicate, was at that time booking his attractions through it and presenting them in Syndicate theatres. This fact, of course, nullified any value O'Neill originally had to the organization whose agreement he had signed. Goodwin, who accused Jefferson of being the first deserter, was himself so designated by *Leslie's Monthly*,[6] in contradiction to his claim that he became allied with the Syndicate only after being deserted by the other parties to the agreement.[7] At any rate, whether he was the first to desert or not, he glad-

[5] *Nat Goodwin's Book*, pp. 106-107.

[6] "The Great Theatrical Syndicate," LIX (November 1904), 38.

[7] *Nat Goodwin's Book*, p. 107.

ly agreed to the Syndicate's offer to have all his business conducted through its booking office without charge. In addition, he quickly accepted an invitation from the Syndicate to use its Knickerbocker Theatre for his annual New York season, for he had experienced some difficulty in the past in securing a desirable New York theatre. Thus Goodwin was another, it developed, for whom the importance of a principle apparently diminished in direct ratio to the benevolence of his opponents' terms.

Fanny Davenport withdrew from the actors' agreement very soon after it was made, simply stating that she had been granted her every wish and that therefore it was no longer necessary for her to oppose the Syndicate. Whether her every wish included insistence upon artistic independence, she did not say.

Francis Wilson encountered considerably more difficulty than Goodwin, Mansfield, or Fanny Davenport. He made a sincere attempt to resist the Syndicate's power but eventually was forced to give in, for the organization chose him, of all its opponents, to wage war upon. The Syndicate accused Wilson of booking one of its theatres and an "opposition" theatre in Washington simultaneously, and banned him thenceforth from their theatres. This Wilson had, in fact, done; but he regarded his act as a simple, logical measure of self-defense, as he explains in the following account of the situation:

> In those days, all dates to play at theatres were tentative. Later, they were either canceled or confirmed. No dates were sure until contracts were signed. Not knowing which of the two theatres in Washington would or would not go into the Syndicate, if it prevailed, I had dates held at both theaters. This was but ordinary protection. The Syndicate, always put to it to justify itself, on learning of this protective measure, cried "Treachery!" and declared I was to be "made an example of as a shining mark, for the benefit of lesser offenders."[8]

Singled out for chastisement by the Syndicate, Wilson was thereafter forced to appear in vaudeville houses and second-class theatres. The other members of the actors' agreement who had deserted to the trust were playing in the Syndicate's first-class theatres, leaving Wilson almost by himself among the top stars forced to appear in the lesser houses. The public, long accustomed to the practice of first-class attractions appearing only in first-class houses, failed to follow Wilson into the second-class theatres. Thus finally, as he expressed it, Wilson was "beaten down hopelessly by the defection of my fellow actor-managers."[9]

Even though Wilson could not continue by himself, the Syndicate realized that he was still popular and would attract large audiences if he appeared in first-class theatres. Thus he was still a desirable star for the Syndicate to book; but having declared him permanently banned from their theatres as an example to other actors, and having seen to it that this action received wide publicity, the members of the Syndicate wished to avoid revoking this punishment openly. Therefore, in order to arrange diplomatically to book Wilson's productions, they arranged to have one of their members, Samuel Nixon, approach Wilson with the suggestion that he would try to convince his partners in the Syndicate to allow Wilson's productions to appear in their theatres, if Wilson would consider selling a half interest in his productions to Nixon and Zimmerman. Wilson had fought the Syndicate with all his resources until he could no longer afford its enmity, and so was more than willing to accept

[8] *Francis Wilson's Life of Himself* (Boston, 1924), pp. 157-158.
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 156.

Nixon's offer. However, actor that he was, he did not wish to appear eager, so asked for time to consider. After a dignified delay of one day, he agreed to the proposition.

Pleased with the arrangement, Wilson later attempted to rationalize it into a victory, as is evident from his interpretation of the matter:

> Out of the wreckage I was adroit enough to make a part of that Syndicate pay what amounted to fifty thousand dollars for the privilege of associating itself with me, when with a little more patience the Syndicate must have forced that association for nothing.
>
> It was not a poor bargain for one who had broken his fortune in fighting for a principle which he consistently hugged to his heart while biding his time for another opportunity.[10]

It is difficult not to sympathize with Wilson's desire thus to salvage his pride, but viewing the matter dispassionately, it is even more difficult to accept his claim that the partnership with Nixon and Zimmerman was consummated as a result of his adroitness. Certainly the Syndicate was at that time in a much better position to succeed without Wilson than he was to survive professionally without it, for let it be remembered that all the other rebels except Mrs. Fiske had already abandoned the fight and were playing in Syndicate theatres. Nor is it any less difficult to believe that the Syndicate, composed as it was of very canny men, was not fully cognizant of Wilson's position and of the fact that in a little while it could very easily "have forced that association for nothing." A much more likely possibility is that the Syndicate simply could see no point in punishing Wilson further. Its aim was not to gain revenge, but rather to be able to present Wilson's attractions in its theatres as a sound investment, and it much preferred to win his good will, if possible, than to suffer his continued enmity.

Of all the players who had so enthusiastically declared war upon the Syndicate, now only Mrs. Fiske remained outside its ranks. Like the others, she had been made enticing offers by the Syndicate, but unlike them, she remained steadfast in her loyalty to her principles. While the others had attacked the Syndicate mercilessly and had spoken freely and loudly in defense of freedom in art, she had said very little. But when the others succumbed to the Syndicate's tempting offers or were forced to ally themselves with the trust, she remained quietly but firmly independent. For all their high sounding rhetoric, most of the others had proved to be more interested in their box-office receipts than in their artistic independence, just as were the members of the Syndicate they had so often branded as money grubbers. But Mrs. Fiske had demonstrated that her opposition to the Syndicate was based solely upon the principle of artistic independence, and she deserves much credit for her determined fight, for she was in no better financial position to remain completely independent than were her former allies.

It may seem unfair to censure too strongly those actors who surrendered to the Syndicate in violation of their agreement, for indeed financial security was then, as it is now, highly desirable. But the fact cannot be ignored that there was an important principle at stake and that the rebels had publicly paid great lip service to that principle. At least it can be said that their defection makes all the more admirable

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 162. Wilson goes on to say that his opportunity came many years later when he headed the Actors' Equity strike in 1919. It is not clear why he regards this as revenge, since it was a strike against theatrical managers in general, and not against the Syndicate. Indeed, the Syndicate was no longer in existence, having come to an end some three years before the strike.

the position of independence maintained by Mrs. Fiske.

When the rebellion was finally over, it became apparent that the members of the Syndicate had emerged victorious from their first serious battle. They had met their opposition cleverly and won fairly. They had realized that a victory for their opponents would have meant the end of the Syndicate, for without enough worthy attractions to present in its theatres, these theatres would have failed to gain patronage. They had been astute enough to allow such favorite veterans as Jefferson and Herne to remain independent, and yet produce most of their plays in Syndicate theatres. They had been shrewd enough to entice such vociferous opponents as Mansfield, Goodwin, and Fanny Davenport over to their side by the simple but artful expedient of offering them greater advantages than they had ever enjoyed before. They had been powerful enough to force such a vigorous enemy as Francis Wilson to surrender, and tactful enough to soften the blow to Wilson's pride. With these tactics they won a hard and skillfully fought battle.

With the fight over, the Syndicate was more solidly established than ever, for now it controlled the booking rights for most of the important stars of the American theatre. Also, despite the heat of the battle, the organization had not remained idle in other matters. During the uprising it had managed to acquire twenty new theatres in large cities from Boston to Denver and from Toronto to Louisville, as well as numerous additional theatres in smaller towns, thus strengthening its grip on the booking rights for the vast majority of first-class theatres on important routes throughout the country. Thus, with the revolt finally quelled, the members of the Syndicate were closer to achieving a monopoly than anyone had ever been in the history of the American theatre—a monopoly so strong that they were able to maintain it until 1910, when it was finally broken by the Shubert organization.

THE IDEA OF COMEDY

> Comedy, we have to admit, was never one of the most honoured of the Muses. She was in her origin, short of slaughter, the loudest expression of the little civilization of men. The light of Athene over the head of Achilles illuminates the birth of Greek Tragedy. But Comedy rolled in shouting under the divine protection of the Son of the Wine-jar, as Dionysus is made to proclaim himself by Aristophanes. Our second Charles was the patron, of like benignity, of our Comedy of Manners, which began similarly as a combative performance, under a licence to deride and outrage the Puritan, and was here and there Bacchanalian beyond the Aristophanic example: worse, inasmuch as a cynical licentiousness is more abominable than frank filth. An eminent Frenchman judges from the quality of some of the stuff dredged up for the laughter of men and women who sat through an Athenian Comic play, that they could have had small delicacy in other affairs when they had so little in their choice of entertainment. Perhaps he does not make sufficient allowance for the regulated licence of plain speaking proper to the festival of the god, and claimed by the Comic poet as his inalienable right, or for the fact that it was a festival in a season of licence, in a city accustomed to give ear to the boldest utterance of both sides of a case.
>
> George Meredith, *An Essay on Comedy* (New York, 1923), pp. 5-6.

KENNETH BURKE'S DRAMATISTIC APPROACH IN SPEECH CRITICISM

L. Virginia Holland

TRADITIONALLY, the rhetorical critic has served as a social critic evaluating a speech in terms of how it meets the social needs and problems of the audience which the speaker faces; and the critic's method, whatever it may be, considers (1) *what* the speaker said, (2) *why* he spoke as he did, and (3) *how* he said it.

The major question with which this paper is concerned may be phrased thus: In the light of the traditional function and objectives of the rhetorical critic, what judgments can we make in evaluating the dramatistic strategy, or approach to criticism, advocated by Kenneth Burke?

The first part of this paper will be concerned with showing what Burke's dramatistic approach is, and how it might be used by the critic of speeches. The second part will be concerned with evaluating the effectiveness of this approach for the speech critic.

Before I attempt to explain Burke's dramatistic approach, several things should first be made clear. Burke takes the classical view that the function or ultimate end of the rhetorical critic is to promote social cohesion and to perfect society. His method considers the traditional objectives of what was said, why it was said as it was, and how it was said. His rhetorical view, however, is not strictly classical in one sense: he contends that the aim or main ideal of criticism is to use *all* that there is to use.[1] That is, he is concerned with *all* language instruments—with poems, plays, novels, and written language as well as with spoken language. For him a rhetorical critic does not *confine* his analysis to the spoken words of a speech. A speech is simply *one* of many kinds of language instruments which a rhetorical critic may very properly analyze.

Burke contends that the rhetorical critic must understand the substance of man, what he is, what his problems are, why he acts as he does, and how he molds the thoughts and concepts of others. Burke believes that man's substance may best be described through the dramatistic metaphor of Man as an Actor.[2] He is an actor acting out his life with the purpose in view of achieving the Ultimate Good.[3] Since man is specifically a symbol-using animal who expresses himself symbolically primarily through linguistic structures, the main way that he acts is verbally, or through the medium of language.[4] Through his verbal "naming" or describing of things and situations he acts in speeches he

L. Virginia Holland (Ph.D., Illinois, 1954) was Instructor in Speech at Washington University in Saint Louis from 1946 to 1953. Her book, Burke's Dramatism and Aristotle, *is scheduled for early publication by Hermes Publications, Los Altos, California.*

[1] Kenneth Burke, *The Philosophy of Literary Form* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1941), p. 23.

[2] For a discussion of *substance* as a concept, see Kenneth Burke's *A Grammar of Motives* (New York, 1945), pp. 21-58, especially pp. 24, 33.

[3] For a further clarification, see Burke's *Attitudes Toward History* (New York, 1937), I, 139, 140, 213-226, and *Permanence and Change* (New York, 1936), pp. 300-301.

[4] Kenneth Burke, *Counter-Statement* (Los Altos, California, 1953), pp. 218, 219.

makes and in documents he writes. Thus a man hates war, but he cannot end it literally or physically with his own hands, so he tries to end it through the use of the word-symbol. He tries to get mankind not to wage war by writing a novel, a speech, a play, a poem, in which he describes the brutalities and terror of war. Consequently, his verbal acts (speeches, play, poem) are his symbolic acts.[5] They are his strategies for meeting and overcoming a situation, or possibly learning to bear it if it cannot be overcome.

Burke believes that all literature grows directly out of a social situation and is a man's response to a condition in human affairs. He says: "All critical and imaginative works are answers to questions posed by the situation in which they arose"; "they are not merely answers, they are *strategic* answers, *stylized* answers."[6]

Thus, from Burke's point of view, a speech is *one* kind of strategic answer to a situation. It is the answer of a man who speaks and who stylizes and fits his answer to the needs of a speaking situation, of an audience, and of himself.

Now the rhetorical critic who is especially concerned with the criticism of speeches and speakers must of course use all that there is to use in relation to the speech situation. And Burke believes that he, like the rhetorical critic concerned with written language, will achieve the most valid critical estimate if he uses the dramatistic strategy, or applies what Burke calls the pentad to the speech.

The strategy of the pentad considers man's action from all of the perspectives which anything can have—from five interrelated motivational or causal points of view. The pentad considers the *Act* (that is, it names *what* took place in thought or deed), the *Scene* (the background of the Act, the situation in which it occurred), the *Agent* (the actor, or kind of person who performed the act), the *Agency* (what means or instruments he used), and the *Purpose* (motive or cause which lay behind a given act).[7] In this pentadic approach man is an actor who *purposively acts* through certain *means* (symbolical or linguistic methods as well as physical), and he carries out his action against the backdrop of the historical *scene*—the time and place in which he lives.

If we were to use this dramatistic method in speech criticism, for example, we would ask ourselves, "What did the speech say (act)? Who was the speaker (actor)? What means, or symbolical linguistic devices did he use to accomplish his purpose (agency)? What was the speaker trying to accomplish through his speech (purpose)? What was the background or situation within which the speech was generated and given (scene)?

From Burke's point of view we can never arrive at a valid, realistic description or naming of the nature or substance of the speech until we consider it from all of these interrelated aspects. Hence Burke believes that the substance of ideal criticism is something more than historical, biographical, sociological, or psychological criticism. This something more, from Burke's point of view, is the "whatness" that emerges from a consideration of the overlap and interrelationship of all of these approaches.

According to Burke, the critic of speeches must realize that a speech is just as much a creative strategy for solving a social problem as building a bridge is a strategy for solving a physical problem. The critic must realize that

[5] *The Philosophy of Literary Form*, p. 8.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 1.
[7] *Grammar of Motives*, pp. xv, xxii.

there are just as many strategies which a speaker may use to solve a situation as there are ways which the speaker has of reacting or responding to a situation. For example, in a situation filled with intolerance, suspicion, and fear, a social critic acting in the role of a speaker might respond with a speech of exhortation in which he tried to incite the audience to adopt certain remedies. On the other hand, he might believe no action should be taken and respond with a speech of satire in which he belittled the fears and suspicions of the audience. In the first case, his over-all strategy to encompass the situation is the strategy of exhortation, in the second case, the strategy of irony.

The speech critic must be aware that there are many ways to conduct an over-all strategy. For example, the speaker using the strategy of exhortation might use such specific devices as these: satirizing, flag-waving, whitewashing, debunking, tear-jerking, getting-on-the-bandwagon, and so on. The *name* which we would give to specific, individual strategies would depend upon our analysis of what the language in the speech was *doing in each part of the speech,* and upon our careful selection of a word which we thought *best described* what the language was doing in each part. Thus the over-all strategy of exhortation is a composite of specific strategies designed to exhort.

Finally, the speech critic must consider what Burke would designate as the strategy of form. According to Burke, "*Form* in literature is an arousing and fulfillment of desires. A work has form in so far as one part of it leads a reader to anticipate another part, to be gratified by the sequence."[8] This concept of form as applied to speechmaking can thus be seen to embrace the concepts of disposition and of style as treated by the classical rhetoricians.[9] Burke subdivides the strategy of form into five strategies: syllogistic progression, qualitative progression, repetitive form, conventional form, and incidental or minor form.[10] Thus each of these subdivisions of the over-all strategy of form shows *how* the language of a speech is doing what it is doing.

From the point of view of the speech critic, speakers use syllogistic progression when they conduct an argument, advancing step by step demonstratively from A to E through steps B, C, and D. On the other hand, a speaker who uses a series of illustrations, each of which is charged with dramatic quality, anticipates the quality of his conclusion, and may be said to be using qualitative progression. A speaker uses repetitive form when he restates a theme by the use of new details. The conventional form of a speech is the appeal which a speech has simply because it is cast in the usual form which a speech takes. When a speaker steps to the platform to present a public address, we do not expect his ideas to be presented to us in sonnet form, or in the dramatistic form of the dialogue of a play. We have certain preconceived notions of the disposition and style of a speech. The conventional form of a speech, then, is the appeal of its form *as form*. Finally, the minor or incidental forms of a speech are those individual strategies within the speech which may be an-

[8] *Counter-Statement,* p. 124.

[9] I am considering disposition here in its general twofold meaning, as embracing both the concept of arrangement, of orderly planning and movement of the whole idea of the speech, as well as the development of the specific divisions of the speech such as the exordium, narration, proof, peroration, or any of the other parts into which certain of the classical rhetoricians divided a speech. I am considering style also in the classical sense of referring specifically to word choice and the way in which words are arranged in the language of a speech.

[10] *Counter-Statement,* pp. 124-128.

alyzed and enjoyed not because of their use but because of themselves: metaphor, apostrophe, paradox.

We have attempted in the foregoing pages to explain what Burke's dramatistic approach to criticism is, and to show how it might be utilized by the critic of speeches. We have attempted to show that a speech, for Burke, is a strategy which is itself a composite of strategies. The second major question which now confronts us is that of evaluation. How effective for the critic of public address is Burke's dramatistic approach? Would it be advantageous to use it?

I wish to make it perfectly clear that the statements of evaluation which follow are in no sense evangelical. I do not feel that Burke has given us all of the answers or the only answers to the problems of speech criticism. Nevertheless, I do feel that Burke's approach is suggestive for the speech critic, and it is in this light that I wish to treat it. Let us consider what the possible gain might be.

I have already suggested that the use of the dramatistic strategy of the pentad might remind the critic of *all* the factors present in any speech situation. It might help the critic avoid emphasizing the biographical element, or a concern with the speaker only as Actor. It might prevent the critic from emphasizing literary criticism, and stressing the speaker's speech as Act, and the Agency or linguistic devices within the speech, without considering these factors in terms of the speaker's purpose and audience. It might prevent criticism from becoming history by emphasizing the scene or background within which the speech was generated and given.

But would the application of the pentad be a nominal or an actual gain for the speech critic? After all, speech criticism has traditionally been concerned with the speaker, the speech, the occasion, and the audience, or with an approach made up of biographical, literary-rhetorical, historical, and psychological entities. Is there any advantage in giving new names to the old familiar things? What is the advantage of calling the speaker an actor? The speech an act? The linguistic devices within the speech an agency? The occasion and the audience the scene?

If there is an answer to these questions, it would seem to lie in the record of our research. As Wichelns wrote in 1925 in his essay, "The Literary Criticism of Oratory": "Histories of criticism, in whole or in part, we now have, and histories of orators. But that section of the history of criticism which deals with the judging of orators is still unwritten."[11] And despite the appearance in 1943 of *A History and Criticism of American Public Address*, which went a long way towards providing us with criticism of orators, we have only to examine individual studies within that work to find criticisms which are not rhetorical in the complete sense of the word, but may be more accurately described as biographical, literary, or historical studies.

If there is an advantage in applying Burke's dramatistic approach to speech criticism, it would seem to be a psychological one, and to lie in the dynamic stress upon the speech as the "action" of an actor in a scene. The imaginative quality of the metaphor might generate a more balanced consideration of all the speech factors entering into speech criticism. Although we might still find ourselves in the predicament of writing rhetorical criticism which placed too

[11] *Studies in Rhetoric and Public Speaking in Honor of James Albert Winans* (New York, 1925), pp. 181-216. My quotation is from p. 181.

much stress upon the actor, or the scene, or any one part of the pentad, there would seem to be a chance that *thinking* of speech criticism in these dramatistic terms might avoid want of balance and result in a more ideal criticism.

For example, the records seem to indicate that when the speech critic *thinks* in terms of the old frames of reference of speaker, speech, audience, and occasion, he falls rather easily into the snare of thinking of the speaker and presenting biographical criticism, or in thinking of the speech and presenting literary criticism, or in thinking of the audience and presenting psychological criticism. In short, he does these things rather than think of the interrelationships of these factors and thus present a rhetorical criticism. Any method emphasizing the organic nature of the speech is so much gain.

While thinking of the speaker as a speaker allows one to criticize him in terms of his personality, thinking of him as an actor focuses attention upon criticizing him in terms of his actions as an actor.[12] Further, it is almost impossible to think of criticizing an actor without at the same time thinking of the part he is playing, what his acts are, what his dialogue is, the scene against which his action is played, and the meaning or purpose of his part in relation to the play as a whole. Since the dramatistic approach of Burke's pentad begins with a stress upon "action," or upon an "acting," the scene is always merely the backdrop or background of the actor. With such an emphasis, the critic is less apt to think that he is criticizing an actor's acting, if he becomes involved in a minute description and analysis of the scene.

There is still a final question of evaluation which cannot be ignored. Would Burke's concept of a speech as a composite of strategies aid us in analyzing the language of a speech? In classifying speeches and speakers? In analyzing the audience and the times?

Traditionally, when we have analyzed a speaker's language from the point of view of content, we have broken it down into the categories of logical, pathetic, and ethical usage. There is the possibility that, if we analyzed the language of a speech in order to discover and "name" the strategies of which it is composed, we might discover a more descriptive way of telling *what language was doing* when we categorized it as being used logically, or pathetically, or ethically. We might even discover that certain specific strategies *more often than not* appeared when language was used logically, while others appeared when it was used ethically, and still others when it was used pathetically.

Traditionally, when we have analyzed language use from the point of view of

[12] There is the *Drama of Creation*. God built the stage, designed the scenery, and wrote the script around the actions of the sole actress in the play, Mother Nature. Within this *Drama of Creation* there are many dramas. One such is the Social Drama, or what Burke would call the *Human Comedy*. Each succeeding generation might be said to provide a new cast for this *Human Comedy*. Each new cast must write the script for its play anew. Although the purpose of the play will always be to show how Man may be preserved as a species, the script of the play will vary, and the plot or course of action will change to show how the social needs and problems of each new generation can be met and resolved. Each human being upon this earth can only act within the physiological limitations *determined* for him by Mother Nature. Yet within these limitations, he *can* determine *how* he acts in his role as individual man and what kind of contribution he wants to make in helping write the script anew for the Social Drama or *Human Comedy* of his generation. One of the most important acting roles which a man can take is that of a philosopher-critic who is sensitive to the shifting social scenery against which he acts out his life role. If that peaceful white cloud in the scenic background shows signs of shaping itself into a gigantic mushroom, he notes it and warns his fellow actors they must write new lines into the social script. One such philosopher-critic is the *speaker*. In the ideal sense he is a man who acts (speaks) in such a way as to cause the writing of better social scripts.

form, we have considered the plan or arrangement of the speech as a whole, as well as the word choice and manner in which the words are arranged in the speech. We have categorized our word arrangements or stylistic devices by such descriptive names as the simile, metaphor, apostrophe, personification, asyndeton, and so on. We have labeled a speaker's style in a general way as grand, plain, or medium. There is a possibility that the use of Burke's strategies of form might be one way of more descriptively explaining *how* the words are saying what they are saying stylistically. We might discover, for example, that the grand style more often makes use of qualitative progression than the plain style does. Any kind of method that might give us additional meaningful ways of talking about speech style, or telling how language is behaving, should be so much to the good. For example, there is a possibility that the statement, "This speaker is using the strategy of exhortation which he is carrying out primarily by using the strategies of flag-waving and invective, expressed stylistically through the strategy of syllogistic progression," *says more, descriptively*, than the statement, "This speaker is persuading through the use of emotional appeal."

Further, Burke's strategy concept might be used as one way of descriptively and dynamically classifying speeches. The ancient rhetoricians categorized speeches as deliberative, forensic, and epideictic. Post-Renaissance tradition has classified them as informative, persuasive, and entertaining. The strategy concept might give us a system for classifying the *kinds* of informative, persuasive, or entertaining speeches. For example, we might classify a persuasive speech as one of exhortation, or sanctification, or defilement. Eventually, we might be able to determine the kinds of strategic language use (or strategies) most often present in persuasive, informative, and entertaining speeches. If we could determine these kinds, we might have a way of attaining a greater understanding of the true nature, or substance, of persuasive, entertaining and informative language per se.

The strategy concept might also provide a descriptive method for classifying the kinds of speakers. For example, speakers might be classified on the basis of the master strategies which they used most consistently, and thus they might be called sanctifiers, defilers, satirists, and so on. It is conceivable that such an approach could give us criteria that would indicate a correlation between a speaker's profession or his beliefs, and the strategies he uses. Eventually, we might be able to predict with reasonable accuracy the strategies we *might expect* to find in the language of groups classified as communists, socialists, democrats, republicans, protestants, catholics, etc.; the strategies we might expect from groups more generally classified as economic and social emancipators; and the strategies we might expect from groups still more generally classified as idealists and materialists. Such knowledge, however we gained it, ought to bring us a heightened critical awareness, and be educationally instructive.

Finally, there is the possibility that the strategy concept might suggest a method of analysis which would give greater insights into the sociological and psychological factors that influence speakers, and into sociology and psychology per se. We might determine the answer to this question, or to questions like this: in what kind of a *situation* does a speaker more often use the master strategy of crusading or of exploitation? Conversely, what are the specific strategies which most often appear in the language of a speech using either of

these master strategies? We might eventually find ourselves in a position where we could, with reasonable accuracy, answer these questions: *Given a certain situation,* what kind of strategies might we anticipate that a speaker will use? *Given certain strategies in a speech,* what kind of a situation does it appear the speaker *believed* he faced?

Such an approach might educate us to become better analysts of the social scene, more cognizant of what the problems of society are thought to be, and more critical of the solutions given to those problems by the social critics operating as speakers and writers.

I should like to conclude by suggesting that if the questions we ask determine the answers we receive, it may be that Kenneth Burke is giving us one method for obtaining rewarding answers. The question of what a speaker's strategies are is inherent in Burke's dramatistic approach to criticism, and it may provide us with one means of obtaining a rhetorical criticism that more nearly approaches the ideal. It may be a means of developing a rhetorical critic who is a more expert judge as a social critic, and who, as a consequence, is himself better qualified to make valid social judgments of his own, and better qualified as an acting rhetorician to popularize them through the language strategies of his own rhetoric.

ORATORY, GRAMMAR, AND LOGIC

> In order to speak, or write well upon any subject, it is necessary that that subject be thoroughly understood, that every argument which is to used be previously collected, and the value of it ascertained. How absurd, for instance, would it be to imagine that a person, who had never studied law, government, and history, should be enabled, by the art of oratory, to make a political harangue, or write a dissertation upon the constitution of a state? With what success would an orator, who had not studied the Law, undertake the defense of a client? or a person wholly unacquainted with morals or theology, attempt to speak from the pulpit? Whatever subject, therefore, any person intends to write or speak upon, he must, by applying to the proper sources, acquire a perfect knowledge of it, before he can expect any assistance from the art of oratory, as such.
>
> Moreover, let a person be ever so perfect a master of his subject, he could not be taught to speak or write about it with propriety and good effect, without being previously instructed in the principles of GRAMMAR, i.e. without a knowledge of the inflection of words, and of the structure of sentences, in the language he makes use of.
>
> It is necessary, likewise, as far as *reasoning* is concerned, that a person be, in some sense, a *logician* before he be an orator; since it is by the rules of LOGIC that we judge of every thing relating to *arguments,* their perspicuity or confusion, their fallacy or their force. More especially is it of consequence to every orator whose business is with *men,* to be well acquainted with *human nature;* that knowing the passions, prejudices, interests, and views of those he hath to do with, he may know how to address them accordingly.
>
> Joseph Priestley, *A Course of Lectures on Oratory and Criticism* (London, 1777), pp. 2-4.

USE OF FIELD MATERIALS IN THE DETERMINATION OF DIALECT GROUPINGS

Sumner Ives

THE term dialect could be used as a horrible example in a lecture on semantics, for the meanings and attitudes which this word signifies are very nearly as diverse as the people who use it. To some, what they say is the language, and what other people say is dialect. Once, in fact, after I had lectured on pronunciation, a member of the audience from New York expressed surprise that a Southerner could show any knowledge of "correct speech." A more scholarly view regards the language as something of an abstraction; it is manifested, that is, spoken or written, in a variety of forms which are called dialects. If one wishes to be very precise, he speaks also of idiolects. The linguist, as a student of language, is interested in all varieties of the language, living or dead, even though as a teacher he might promote those particular forms which are associated with education and prestige.

Any actual utterance, or stretch of language, can be broken down into at least three simultaneous elements. We can study language, in part, by focusing our attention, in turn, on these elements. The utterance has individual sounds; these are used to form words; and these words are put together according to the rules of grammar peculiar to the language of the utterance. There may be dialectal differences in all three elements. Thus, a person may use different vowels or the same vowel in *horse* and *hoarse*, he may call a certain container for liquids a *pail* or a *bucket*, and he may say *hadn't ought* or *ought not*. However, I shall here talk only about differences in pronunciation.

It has been customary to divide pronunciation differences into three categories. There may be variety in the sound of single phonemes such as the pronunciation of *night* as [na:t] or as [naɪt]; there may be differences in the distribution of phonemes such as the use of the same or different vowels in *marry* and *merry* or in the choice of vowels for *wash* and *water;* and there may be variation in the total number of phonemic contrasts such as having one sound in *tin can* [kɛ:n] and another in *I think I can* [kæn], or having the same vowel in all words like *cot* and *caught*.

These dialectal differences are all within the province of segmental phonology. But there are also dialectal differences which are in the province of supra-segmental phonology, such matters as voice qualifying, tempo, pitch pattern, and stress pattern. For example, in some sections people stress *are* in *how are you* and in other sections they stress *you*. These supra-segmental characteristics have not been studied very thoroughly, and there is no standard methodology for dealing with all of them, although symbolizations for pitch, stress, and juncture seem to be in process of establishment. This delay is partly

Sumner Ives (Ph.D., Texas, 1950) is Associate Professor of English at Tulane University. *This paper was read in a sectional program on Research Accomplished and Needed in the Area of Phonetics at the Convention of the Speech Association of America in Chicago, December 28, 1954.*

due to the difficulties inherent in the collection of field material or basic data and partly to the fact that the segmental characteristics should be studied first.

Differences in pronunciation may correlate with social factors or with geographical areas; generally there are both social and geographical limitations on the occurrence of particular pronunciations. The social differences may agree with one or more of several circumstances. One of these is age. There are always some pronunciations which are moving towards disappearance, and there are some innovations which are moving towards acceptance. This consequence of language growth makes, at any given time, differences in language habits which correlate roughly with the generation to which the individuals belong. For example, the habit of pronouncing *horse* and *hoarse* alike seems to be gaining ground in New York State, and the use of a somewhat centralized beginning for the diphthong in *night* seems to be losing out. This sort of thing makes it possible, often, to mark dialect limits which agree with age rather than with social class or geographical area, or to find age limitations in addition to the others. Since such changes operate more rapidly in some localities than in others of a different type, the dialect picture is often very complex.

The most commonly observed social factor agreeing with speech differences is education, but often the effect of education is not so great as we think. We speak of speech as being educated or uneducated; or we might use such terms as folk speech, common or popular speech, and cultivated speech, regarding these terms as applicable to levels or hierarchies of esteem. However, the more we learn about class structure, and about linguistic habits which correlate with class structure, the more reluctant we are to accept the number of years in school as a definitive criterion. When I listened to some of the tape recordings of the speech of college students in Georgia collected by C. K. Thomas, I noticed pronunciations which are, in Georgia, regarded as typical of lower or middle class speech. In my own study of pronunciation in New Orleans, both of white and negro informants, I see that education is but one of several factors correlating with dialect difference and that there are consistent differences in the pronunciation of people with equivalent formal education. Social mobility, or movement from one cultural group to another, the spread of educational opportunity, and the existence of groupings based on the local criteria for social esteem all tend to limit the value of education as a distinguishing mark of social class.

These social differences in dialect are most obvious in sections of the country where family tradition shares responsibility with the school in the development of the cultural attitudes, where the consciousness of class is more compelling, sometimes, than the textbook. This influence of tradition generally operates more strongly at the extreme ends of the social scale than in the middle. Thus, there is sharp consciousness of social dialect in areas like the Southeast, where there is historically a local aristocracy based on birth and a class whose members have had relatively little opportunity for social or economic betterment. There, an elderly man who was confident of his status as a gentleman might use *ain't* freely in conversation, but he would not pronounce *police* with accent on the first syllable or *night* with the same long vowel he would use in *five*.

In spite of the actual complexity found in the speech habits of the United States, we can speak of dialects, both

social and geographical, provided we do not imply or assume complete homogeneity within each class or region. In practice we define dialects by specifying the occurrence of particular pronunciations, but the naming of these particular pronunciations should not be taken as implying that the identified dialect differs from other dialects in all the characteristics which have not been named. In practice, we get the best results by using the occurrence of more than one feature. For example, the general dialect which Hans Kurath calls South Midland and C. K. Thomas calls Southern Mountain is characterized by having the retroflex variety of postvocalic *r*, by the use of a different vowel in *four* and *forty*, and by the pronunciation [grizɪ] rather than [grisi]. All these features are found outside the region of this dialect, but when they all occur together the combination defines the dialect. Calling the speech so defined a dialect does not, however, imply that it differs from other American English in all its characteristics, or that it is homogeneous within its limits. Some such procedure as this has served to define General American, although a linguist can discover very nearly as many differences among the speakers of this dialect as there are between this dialect and others spoken in this country.

Such a method of associating particular definitive characteristics of speech with areas or classes which have other elements of homogeneity has been very useful in the study of American English. The major product from the examination of field materials is the isogloss—more properly, when talking about pronunciation, the isophone. And it is the observation and selection of isoglosses which give order to the study of dialects. Two basic procedures for drawing them have been implicit in publications on the subject.

Kurath and those who have worked with the Linguistic Atlas look for the outer limits of occurrence of pronunciations which are significant. For example, E. Bagby Atwood, in his study of eastern Virginia speech, selected pronunciations of that region and then charted the instances of each pronunciation which were found in the field material. His isoglosses were lines drawn around the outer limits of these instances, although a widely isolated instance might not be included in the line. When contrasting pronunciations of the same item are studied, as for example [ɑn] rather than [ɔn] for the preposition *on*, two lines are derived. One is the outer limit of [ɑn]; the other is the outer limit of [ɔn]. These lines will show that there is an area where both pronunciations are in use. Isoglosses of this type are always based on the presence of something rather than the absence of something, for it should never be assumed that a sample contains everything which exists in the region.

The field material of the Linguistic Atlas consists of phonetic transcriptions of the responses made by selected informants to a questionnaire of over 700 items. The field worker tried to secure the desired item without himself pronouncing the word in question. Since the circumstances of the investigation limited the field worker to about three interviews each two weeks, the sampling is rather thin, there being about 2,000 for the Atlantic states. Moreover, about half the records were secured from the oldest and least educated people available in the communities studied, and this fact must be remembered in drawing conclusions from the results of the survey.

The Atlas materials are particularly useful for problems of history—such matters as the development of English

phonology, changes in the distribution of particular features, the survival of relics, the delimitation of culturally isolated areas, the tracing of settlement movements, and the spread of culture elements like the plantation system. In phonemic analysis and in the determination of prestige characteristics, the Atlas materials must be used with caution. Although a skillful student can get a great deal from them on these points, he must know exactly what he is doing. Aside from the limitations of coverage, the major lack in the Atlas materials derives from the difficulty in transcribing extended utterances, free conversation, and such matters as pitch and stress. Consequently, their usefulness in investigating supra-segmental phonology is limited.

A different procedure has been used by Thomas. His basic method is to make a tape recording as the informant reads a text prepared to bring out those features which Thomas has found useful in defining dialects. By this method, he does not require a trained phonetician in gathering his material, nor does he have to contend with differences in transcription habits, which complicate the analysis when more than one field worker is used. Also, he is able to accumulate speech samples from more people in a shorter time than required when the Atlas method is used. At the same time, his text does not contain the number of items found in the Atlas questionnaire.

It is my understanding, too, that Thomas uses a different method in determining speech boundaries. He has secured large maps of the United States on which each county is marked. On these maps, he notes occurrences of the different pronunciations. Boundaries are located where majority usage shifts. By this method, Thomas is able to say something about the density of occurrence—that is, what the majority usage is—and about the prestige value of the pronunciations he studies. Moreover, a tape recording preserves more of the phonological characteristics than even the most skillful phonetic transcription, although this evidence must be used carefully, for the gross characteristics of reading aloud are seldom quite the same as those of free conversation. I think, therefore, that the records being accumulated by Thomas will be useful in studying some supra-segmental characteristics—most of those relevant to grammar—but not in studying all of them.

These represent, so far as I know, the largest accumulations of field material gathered specifically for the study of American dialects, although some more limited bodies of material have been gathered, notably the collection of Middle South speech being made by C. M. Wise. There is, however, another study of American pronunciation which should be mentioned. George Trager, working now with Henry Lee Smith, Jr., has published a phonemic analysis, or rather a series of analyses, for English. Trager's interest is less in the determination of dialect boundaries than in the development of a procedure for representing the phonemic structure of any variety of American English. His material is particularly useful for such purposes as the preparation of textbooks in English for foreigners and as the representation of English morphology. It includes symbolization for pitch, stress, and juncture, those supra-segmental components of the utterance which are known to be relevant to grammar. I have said nothing about his field material or how he uses it, for his publications are not explicit on those points.

I shall say a few words now about my own current research in phonology, for some of the study differs from that al-

ready described. Last summer I began working with the Urban Life Research Institute at Tulane University. This is a group of sociologists, social workers, and psychologists, whose function is the study of various aspects of class structure and mobility in an urban area. One of the constant problems is finding a means of defining or delimiting class or cultural group and for estimating social mobility, or the movement of the individual from one culture group to another. Employment of such criteria as income, education, and the use of leisure time does not give the desired sharpness of demarkation, for such matters are generally in continuum; moreover, since these are also the object of study, their use as defining criteria admits the danger of circularity in the results.

Last summer I made detailed transcriptions of several tape recordings of interviews with negro subjects. These interviews were only partially directed, and no attempt was made to elicit the pronunciation of particular words. They were, for all practical purposes, the normal conversation of the subjects, except for the fact that some passages were rather long. I was able to isolate a number of words whose pronunciation was significantly different in the body of records and to make a tentative grouping of the records into two classes, with one class showing two dialects. My estimates as to the cultural grouping, and even to the mobility of one informant, agreed with the grouping made according to non-linguistic criteria. My grouping fitted into the hypothesis about class structure among New Orleans negroes which a member of the Institute had already formulated on other evidence.

Since then, using these records as a basis but adding other items to insure adequate coverage, I have developed a questionnaire designed particularly for this problem in this area. Since this type of questionnaire could be useful in other localities, I shall describe it briefly. It is presented to the informant as a simple verbal efficiency test, and we hope that he will not realize his pronunciation is being sampled. In the first part, the informant is asked to list such things as the days of the week and the months of the year. In the second part he supplies the missing word in such sentences as "Dairies have ( ) which give milk." He is expected to say "cow," but actually the words *dairies* and *milk* are the important items in the sentence. The third part has logical sequences like *inch, foot, yard, mile.* One item is omitted, and the informant is asked to supply it. The last part contains simple analogies like *boy-girl* paired with *father-mother.* One of the terms is omitted and to be supplied. The entire questionnaire is read by the informant and recorded on tape. There is enough duplication so that no great harm is done if the informant misses some of the items which he is to supply. This test is to give the segmental characteristics of his speech.

The supra-segmental characteristics are derived from study of other recorded material. All informants in the current project are interviewed at some length, and at least one of the individual interviews is recorded. Since these interviews lead the subject to talk more or less at will on a variety of subjects, they contain a great deal of evidence.

I have already discovered that there are some phonological characteristics which occur consistently in the speech of the negroes whose social status is lowest. I have not yet heard them in the speech of white people whose economic and educational status is the same, nor have I heard them in the speech of other negroes of higher status. I have also observed some interesting correlations

between the base pitch from which grammatically significant shifts are made and the emotional accompaniments to the content of the sentence. That is, this base pitch is not basic to all the speech but shifts from one to another of, I think, three points, according to the subject of the discourse and the speaker's reaction to it. However, I have not examined enough material, as yet, to know just what is phonetic and what is phonemic. Moreover, the nature of the interviews is such that distinctly different voice qualifiers can be detected. These are especially interesting in one interview, for the circumstances and subject matter are such that the emotional overtones fluctuate during the course of the interview. Some striking correlations between voice qualifier—especially whine—and the subject matter are evident. The dialectal significance of this lies in the fact that the social status of the informant affects the relationship between voice qualifier and subject matter.

When this aspect of dialect study is more mature, I think that the linguists will have something useful not only for other scholars and for teachers of language but for all fields dealing with class structure and with the individual's adjustment to society. Who knows, we might be able to spot a person's social status as accurately as can an experienced clubwoman and tell as much about their insecurities as a good cop.

LEARNING SYLLABLES

For learning syllables there is no short way; they must all be learned throughout; nor are the most difficult of them, as is the general practice, to be postponed, that children may be at a loss, forsooth, in writing words. Moreover, we must not even trust to the first learning by heart; it will be better to have syllables repeated, and to impress them long upon the memory; and in reading too, not to hurry on, in order to make it continuous or quick, until the clear and certain connexion of the letters become familiar, without at least any necessity to stop for recollection. Let the pupil then begin to form words from syllables, and to join phrases together from words. It is incredible how much retardation is caused to reading by haste; for hence arise hesitation, interruption, and repetition, as children attempt more than they can manage; and then, after making mistakes, they become distrustful even of what they know. Let reading, therefore, be at first sure, then continuous, and for a long time slow, until, by exercise, a correct quickness is gained. For to look to the right, as everybody teaches, and to look forward, depends not merely on rule, but on habit, since, while the child is looking to what follows, he has to pronounce what goes before, and, what is very difficult, the direction of his thoughts must be divided, so that one duty may be discharged with his voice, and another with his eyes.

Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, trans. John Selby Watson (London, 1882), I, 16-17.

COMMUNICATION THEORY: II. EXTENSION TO INTRAPERSONAL BEHAVIOR

Ralph Franklin Hefferline

COMMUNICATION was dealt with in the first part of this paper as the process, literally, of making common. Parts of a system were said to be in effective communication when activity, excitement, information in one part of the system comes to be shared by, participated in, or, in short, communicated to, the other parts. Automatic machines which carry out "instructions" which have been coded on a moving tape of some sort were discussed as exemplifying a limited kind of self-regulation. The human organism, unlike the most ingeniously "self-controlled" robot, acquires its repertory of performable acts, not from arbitrary design, but from organic growth and learning. Physical development is relatively standard for the species, but what the individual is taught and how he is taught depends largely on accidents of time, place, and parentage.

Socialization process—the protracted training of the human animal to conform to local folkways—tends to bring about what, superficially considered, is "social adjustment." This may, however, mask a chronic, suppressed, more or less intense rebelliousness. Of this the individual is likely to be for the most part unaware. What he experiences is restlessness and dissatisfaction, or else a general lack of energy and a feeling that his problems are too much for him.

In what follows it will be shown that strongly motivated behavior, when denied overt expression, persists covertly as chronic patterns of tension within the organism. In some degree this seems to be the situation of all of us. However, we now have less need to be resigned about it. Modern techniques will be described for reestablishing the disrupted lines of communication between the intrapersonal and interpersonal systems—that is, between the individual and the group—on a basis which permits solution, instead of suppression, of the original problems.

A clue to the development of "bottled-up" behavior emerges from a review of our early training. At that time we are held accountable only for behavior which is directly observable. Parents reward and punish what they actually see. What we learn to do privately—in thought, dream, or waking fantasy—escapes detection and thus seems entirely different, as indeed it is in its successful avoidance of immediate social reprisal. However, the actual presence in the intrapersonal system of behavior which is not directly observable may be inferred or even brought under observation by special techniques. For instance, the so-called lie-detector exploits the fact that it is exciting to tell a lie and, furthermore, that evidence of excitement may be found in changed respiration, pulse-rate, blood-volume, skin-resistance, and so on.

Ralph Franklin Hefferline (Ph.D., Columbia, 1947) is Assistant Professor of Psychology at Columbia University. In collaboration with Frederick S. Perls and Paul Goodman he is author of Gestalt Therapy: Excitement and Growth in the Human Personality *(New York, 1951).* *Part I of the present article appeared in the preceding Issue of the* QJS.

Less sensational, but more systematically revealing, is the faint, but unmistakable, behavior disclosed by electromyography. The movements which constitute visible behavior are produced by muscular contractions, and these are attended by electrical phenomena called action potentials. Now suppose that a person, with electrodes suitably attached, is told to "think of" or to "imagine" performing a particular action. While carrying out the instructions, he may make no visible movements; nevertheless, if the instrument for picking up and amplifying action potentials is sufficiently sensitive, it will be found that the appropriate muscles have run through a patterned sequence of activity which is the same, except in magnitude, as that involved when the action is performed "in reality." Thinking and imagination, in the instances thus far susceptible to this kind of test, prove to be a kind of doing in miniature. That it is genuine *doing* is now beyond question.[11]

The fact that faint behavior may be invisible to an external observer does not necessarily indicate that it is so faint as to be unobservable by the person himself. He is in a privileged position, not with respect to seeing his own behavior as others see it, but with respect to "feeling" it proprioceptively, or, to use the older term, kinesthetically. Through sense organs embedded in muscles, joints, and tendons, he may respond to his own movements, to patterns of tension, or even to diffuse changes in his over-all tonus or readiness for action. These are important intrapersonal communications which, especially if talked about internally—that is, subvocally—constitute a good part of what has traditionally been called consciousness. When we say, "The idea popped into my head," a more sensitive account of what happened could often be, "Activity developing within my organism reached a stage that obliged me to take notice of it." When we say, after staying for a time at a dull gathering, "I think it is time to go," we might more precisely, if less politely, report, "I find myself more and more oriented toward the door, and the muscles which would lift me from my chair are already somewhat contracted."

Formal education works directly to set up such "invisible behavior." When educators, for instance, try to "teach the student to think," they proceed in ways calculated to promote miniature, intrapersonal functioning. Ultimately, of course, they are concerned with what the student does in full view, but, since they believe that his public doings are more likely to be correct if preceded by a private "dry run" or rehearsal, they discourage impulsive, premature reactions and uphold the motto: "Think before you act." The way to think, they say, is to "consider the consequences," "follow up logical implications," "visualize the whole situation," "check on whether there are other possible solutions," and so on. Carrying out such instructions constitutes training in speaking subvocally, making minute gestures, attending to images of various kinds—in short, training both in building and in operating the intrapersonal communications system. The value to the individual and to society of "prebehaved" behavior is that many actions which would prove regrettable, or at least inadequate, are rejected after their "private showing" and those which do get lived out in the full social context are likely to be in better accord with the situation's genuine requirements.

The "authorities" cast a less kindly

[11] Edmund Jacobson, "Electrophysiology of Mental Activities," *Amer. J. Physio.*, XLIV (1932), 677-694.

eye on indications of invisible behavior conducted for its own sake, which they condemn as daydreaming, fantasy, or morbid self-preoccupation. It may even be implied that "that way lies madness." Clinical workers on the whole regard it less harshly, recognizing it as universal and inevitable when the social situation becomes unusually frustrating. It is, in any case, remarkable that the repertory built by the socialization process in the interests of conformity should ever become sufficiently autonomous as to enable the person to break contact with society and to live after a fashion in what is merely an intrapersonal version of it.

In the course of training the more reputable forms of invisible behavior, a teacher may, after giving the student a problem to "think through," ask him from time to time to report on how the process is coming along. If it has bogged down, a hint or reminder may set it going again. Such prompting need not supply new information, but merely call attention to something relevant that is already in the student's repertory. Depending on the kind of problem, the student may somewhere along the line exclaim, "Now I get the point," and then proceed to a quick solution. In these instances of "insight" it may be as if all the necessary materials for the solution were available from the start, but needed to be tried in various orders and combinations until the appropriate arrangement was produced and recognized.

Speakers are interesting when they say what we are almost, but not quite, able to say. They precipitate in our own behavior novel arrangements or significant new sequences which we were close to but had not reached—and might never have reached unassisted. Speakers are dull and we stop listening when they say what we can already say and perhaps say better. They put us through behavioral routines that are "old stuff." They are also dull when their repertory and ours have little in common, for then we cannot behave with them to advantage. They do not tune in any well-developed behavior of our own and assist in developing it further. When listening to a technical presentation of some sort, if we lack the necessary terminology and prior acquaintance with the subject, we say, "I don't get it." Those in the audience who do "get it" are those who would be to some degree qualified to do the speaking themselves, for they already possess much the same repertory as the speaker.

A difficult textbook may, on first reading, be incomprehensible. But we can re-expose ourselves to it again and again as we cannot to a speaker. A second reading will clear up some items, which shows that even the initial encounter was not without effect. We may go over key passages slowly, perhaps whispering them aloud, or we may stop while we "think about" the argument just presented. The more we behave with it, the more the material becomes organized in our own behavior as it was organized in the behavior of the author. We fully understand the author when we can say what he says for good and sufficient reasons—that is, when we can say it on our own *as if we ourselves were the author.*

Similarly, we understand what those about us are doing if we are familiar with the context of their behavior—the present situation and their past experience—and are able to run through in private miniature the patterns and sequences which they are producing publicly. And we understand our own behavior when we find ourselves doing what we have been systematically taught

to expect and to require from ourselves. These types of "making common" comprise the bulk of what is commonly regarded as "communication in the full human sense," but if the foregoing account is correct, the only special characteristics lie in the range and intricacy of the human repertory and the manner in which it is acquired.

At a point far back we posed the question: "What manner of tape, if any, runs the human organism?" Subsequent discussion has roughly traced the development of the human repertory, stressing the fact that the organismic system, unlike the man-made robot, is capable of undergoing change and reclassification of the behaviors which it carries in stock. Healthy development results in an ever-closer integration of the individual with the larger social system of which he is a part; but integration is by no means a one-sided conformity of the individual to society. Society also conforms to the individual. The process is reciprocal, from society to the individual and from the individual to society, and is not hard to conceptualize if one does not persist in the outmoded procedure of trying to decide which phase is cause and which effect.

During historic times the socialization process has specialized successively in the production of different kinds of human individual. This was brilliantly pointed out by David Riesman in *The Lonely Crowd*, where he described man as "tradition-directed," "inner-directed," or "other-directed"—with now a glimmering of "autonomous man."[12] The tradition-directed person of older, relatively unchanging societies was guided through life by unmistakable signposts in the form of etiquette, ritual, and rigid procedure. In western history the Middle Ages can be considered a period in which the majority were tradition-directed.

With the Renaissance and Reformation came increased personal mobility, expressed in exploration, colonization, and expanded production both of goods and people. Novel situations were encountered calling for unprecedented choice of action. The problem of personal choice, no longer capable of being handled by lifelong channeling through a rigid social organization, came to be dealt with by putting heavy emphasis in childhood on the formation of personal "character." Riesman employs the metaphor of a built-in "psychological gyroscope." Such an instrument, once it was set by parents and other authorities, maintained its spin and kept the individual "on course."

With further increase in social complexity, "gyroscopic control" becomes insufficiently flexible. Participation in conquest of the material environment begins to be replaced as the central organizer of individual behavior by concern for how one is regarded by other people. In this type of direction it becomes increasingly important to obtain assurance and reassurance that one is accepted and "belongs," and more attention must be paid to the signals from others to verify "how one is doing" and to check on what is "the latest" in the group where one feels it vitally important to "fit in." Since throughout life the signals may shift with changes in technology and general living conditions, the "other-directed" person cannot afford to have a rigidly internalized code of behavior; instead, what must be built into him is the elaborate equipment for tuning in the signals and for occasional participation in their circulation. Riesman's metaphor for this type of direction is the radar. However, despite its effectiveness in achieving su-

[12] (New Haven, 1950), pp. 24-45.

perficial co-ordination of human behavior, this newer type of socialization is all too prone to foster the condition which various writers have characterized as "anomie," "affectlessness" or "emptiness."

Description of these three styles of socialization has deliberately exaggerated their robotizing effect upon the human individual, but something analogous to the servomechanism's tape is indeed present. For the tradition-directed individual the socialization process did not need to concentrate on childhood training, since the social situation itself presented standard guide-lines throughout the life course. For both the inner-directed and the other-directed types of individual, childhood is crucial as the stage when there can be internalized—that is, built into the individual behavior system—either a relatively fixed code of behavior or a relatively fixed mode of seeking and obtaining directives for current behavior. In each of the three types the individual is in large degree the involuntary beneficiary or victim of the socialization process.

For those who like to extol the spontaneity and creativeness of the human individual, such a picture of him as hopelessly enmeshed in the social machinery for producing conformity must be most unattractive. Such distaste, however, would not be adequate grounds for denying it as factually correct—if it were the whole picture. Riesman does not assert that it is. Rather, he finds in the contemporary scene instances of what he calls "autonomous man." This kind of individual is not clearly defined, partly because he does not fit readily into any pre-established category. But what seems to characterize him is that, despite being well-equipped with "radar," he is not compulsively at its mercy. He can, at least on occasion, turn it on or off to suit himself.

Other close observers of the social scene have glimpsed the coming of "unitary man"[13] or "man for himself"[14] or simply the "healthy human organism"; and in their efforts at description they have employed such terms as flexibility, as opposed to rigidity, integration as opposed to forced adjustment, breadth and depth of functioning as opposed to narrowness and superficial contact. It is as if an ability to "see through" the socialization process results, not in cynicism or disillusionment, but in a relatively conflict-free, genuinely productive orientation. Such individuals, it would seem, must have been spared the common lot of excessive conformity-pressures in childhood, or else, in later years, through good fortune or expert assistance, had the robotizing effects of early "internalizations" significantly diminished. Many of the changes in child-rearing practices in the last generation or so and most of the activities conducted explicitly or implicitly along therapeutic lines would work in this direction.

A most significant development has been a revaluation of the efficacy of punishment as a technique for shaping the behavioral repertory. Clinicians have long been concerned with "traumatizing" effects, and in recent years their intuitions have been confirmed in the experimental laboratory, where it has been demonstrated that the age-old method of punishment, even when it attains its immediate aim, tends to give rise to side effects ultimately more trou-

[13] Lancelot Law Whyte, *The Next Development in Man* (New York, 1948), pp. 246-277.

[14] Erich Fromm, *Man for Himself* (New York, 1947).

blesome than the behavior originally punished.[15]

Punishment yields a quick result. Notably, it removes from the sight of the punisher the behavior which he found unacceptable. But it does not, as is now well established, eliminate the punished behavior from the repertory of the organism punished. Instead, when punished, an organism, be it animal, child, or man, must now, to avoid further punishment, redirect some of its behavior—behavior which otherwise would have been available for coping with practical tasks in the external environment—to the new task of holding back from expression those parts of its repertory which would, if openly manifested, incur punishment.[16] The condemned behavior must be actively inhibited. The term inhibition, as ordinarily used, covers both the behavior held back and the behavior which accomplishes the holding back. It involves the simultaneous contraction of those muscles which are the agonists—or doers—and the opposing muscles, or antagonists. The result is behavioral deadlock, or at least behavioral friction, with one part of the intrapersonal communications system tied up in the work of keeping another part in chronic check. This is what was hinted at earlier when it was suggested that the individual could commit partial suicide by "killing off" portions of his repertory.

Blocking our own action for good and sufficient reasons on a temporary basis has, of course, no pathological implications. A runner on the starting line waiting for the gun furnishes a dramatic example of blocked behavior, but his system, fully mobilized for running, applies its brakes only until the official signal is given. Countless times a day we hold back incipient behavior when the situation is not quite or not yet appropriate for its release. But we have not the slightest intention of holding back forever.

On the other hand, when behavior is punished in a child, the "authority" who does the punishing usually implies or actually proclaims that such behavior is to be banned for all time. The question of whether there may be socially acceptable alternatives which might suitably reorganize the behavior seldom enters the context at all. Whole areas of activity may be proscribed for a particular child, especially those construed by the punisher as sexual in nature, aggressive, or even, in some families, merely "excited."

To the extent that children display behavior that is definitely antisocial, its control through punishment might be deemed unfortunate but necessary in the social interest. But much of what gets punished in childhood is merely the precocious appearance of what not only is sanctioned in the adult but actually demanded of him. The individual overtrained in the role of dutiful child does not readily display the initiative, ingenuity, or authority which society requires of the adult. He has learned his lesson too well and continues to block behavior which, formerly punished, is now appropriate to his adult status. This is the epidemic condition clinically diagnosed as residual tension. While conspicuous in stiff, shy, or withdrawn individuals, it is not directly obvious in the bulk of the adult population but manifests itself indirectly in complaints of aches and pains, cramps and tensions, and a "run down feeling." The present-day cult which attempts to

[15] William K. Estes, "An Experimental Study of Punishment," *Psychol. Monogr.*, LVII, No. 263 (1944).

[16] James Dinsmoor, "Punishment: I. The Avoidance Hypothesis," *Psychol. Rev.*, LXI (January 1954), 34-46.

follow such mottoes as "you must relax," while it does correctly identify the problem, can be but partially successful and only in certain situations, for the oversocialized individual cannot afford to stay relaxed under circumstances where he is tempted to "talk back," "get sexy," or otherwise "get excited." Unless he stiffens against such developing behavior, he fears that he will "lose control" and precipitate catastrophe. Some individuals must remain alertly on guard in all situations, only partially relaxing even while asleep.

Electromyographic investigations have been made by Malmo and coworkers at McGill University of headaches produced by chronic contraction of the musculature of head and scalp.[17] They find these related to unexpressed resentment. They also suggest that leg cramps of a certain kind may be related to sexual inhibition, and arm and shoulder cramps to the inhibition of aggression. A general review of this subject has been presented by Robert Plutchik under the title, "The Role of Muscular Tension in Maladjustment," in which he proposes as a new criterion for normality "freedom from chronic muscular tension."[18]

The approach of psychotherapy to the problem is a verbal one. The patient is encouraged to talk about what he has formerly held back. At intervals the therapist, depending on his school of thought, makes interpretations, which may range all the way from shrewd observations of the patient's behavior to dogmatic pronouncements. This exchange, when effective, loosens up the more or less rigid restrictions that prevail within the patient's intrapersonal communications system. If encouraged to approach old situations in the external environment where he met defeat before, he may, instead of blocking himself in an automatic, stereotyped way, now discover socially acceptable ways of expressing behavior previously punished or may find that, having outgrown the status of childhood, the earlier taboos no longer hold—or may even learn that, having once dared to express something held back until now, he has somehow "cleaned it out of his system." When ineffective, therapeutic techniques conducted exclusively at the verbal level merely add to the patient's verbal repertory. He may acquire encyclopedic knowledge of his symptoms and their theoretical implications without any other marked changes in behavior.

Since muscles are well equipped with sense organs, the proprioceptors, which supply information to the organism of movements, or even states of muscular tension without movement, it is paradoxical that chronic muscular blocking should not be more readily recognized as such. After a fashion it is recognized, but ascribed to recent strain, to "nervousness," to annoying circumstances, to rheumatism, arthritis, and a host of other conditions of which the organism seems to be the passive, innocent victim. Attempted remedies are equally various, ranging from drug store "painkillers," medical attention, massage, and heat treatments, to change of scene, strenuous efforts to relax, or even a course of detailed instructions in "progressive relaxation."[19] Such methods are likely to be temporary palliatives, with no lasting effects achieved until something is done about the "unfinished business" which clogs and tightens the intrapersonal system.

[17] Charles Shagass and Robert B. Malmo, "Psychodynamic Themes and Localized Muscular Tension during Psychotherapy," *Psychosomatic Medicine*, XVI (July-August 1954), 312.
[18] *J. Gen. Psychol.*, L (January 1954), 57.

[19] Edmund Jacobson, *Progressive Relaxation* (Chicago, 1929).

The paradox lies in the fact that, although the muscular blocking is produced by the so-called "voluntary muscles," the person experiences no voluntary contribution and scoffs at such a notion. If he tenses himself by contraction of voluntary muscles, it is unthinkable to him that he could not voluntarily relax them. If reminded that he has the voluntary muscles needed to wiggle his ears and yet cannot wiggle them, he is unconvinced or regards this as an irrelevant coincidence. He will readily acknowledge, however, that skills to which he once had to devote painstaking attention now run themselves off automatically because they have become "second nature." If he tries to watch how he performs such automatized activity, the result is interference with or disruption of the sequence.

On the other hand, if the stakes are high enough, it is well known that behavior can be extensively reorganized. After an amputation or a disabling disease, remarkable recovery of the former repertory may be achieved with those structures which are still intact. Any special training procedures employed—for instance, the techniques of "proprioceptive facilitation"[20] used with polio victims, partial spastics, or others who retain only certain of their muscles in a healthy, functional state—are applicable also to behavioral blockings where all the muscles are organically unimpaired.

Suppose a "normal person" is asked to report verbally on a systematic proprioceptive exploration of his own body, conducted in private with minimum external distractions and preferably while lying down so as to eliminate the work of the antigravity muscles. If asked whether he can "feel"—that is, proprioceptively discriminate the presence or absence of—all or any part of his skeletal musculature, his first reply will be that, yes, of course he can do this. On further inquiry, however, it usually turns out that with respect to various parts of his body, what he took to be proprioceptive "feel" was actually a visualization of the part—or else he had to amplify proprioception by actual movement of the parts.

With further work, if he can be prevailed upon to persist in something which seems so fatuous, he finds that certain parts of his body are for him proprioceptively nonexistent. Suppose it is his neck. He may discriminate a mass which is his head and a mass which is his trunk with what seems to be some empty space between. At this stage the person is likely to remember "more important things to do" and abruptly terminate further participation in this silly business.

Some individuals, though, made curious by the peculiar blank spots and hopeful of recovering sensation in the unfelt parts, learn to pay increasingly close attention to those areas of reduced sensitivity. The result may be that a blank spot will gradually fill in, so that it will "feel" like other parts. Or it may suddenly be filled with sharp pains, with peculiar sensations of one sort or another, particularly electric-like vibrations, or with the unmistakable ache of muscular cramp. At this stage what was previously a blank spot may become as demanding of attention as an aching tooth. The latent conflict—the unfinished business—has been remobilized.

Further discriminations become possible, such as the relation of the cramped muscles to each other, their angles of stretch, and their points of insertion on bone. When the person stays alert to minute changes in the situation, this

[20] Herman Kabat, "Central Mechanisms for Recovery of Neuro-muscular Function," *Science*, CXII (July 7, 1950), 23-24.

gives rise to what in the old days was called ideomotor action, which may in itself bring a loosening of the muscular clinch. Or the person, if he can increase the clinch deliberately, may, while relaxing from this added intensity, learn something about relaxing still further. In other words, voluntary control of so-called voluntary muscles is re-establishing itself, or, in some cases, establishing itself for the first time.

Release of a muscular block is frequently accompanied by a vivid, spontaneous recall of typical situations, perhaps dating back to childhood, where the person learned to tense in this particular manner. The high correlation between recovered movements and recovered memories supports a "motor theory of consciousness." More specifically, it reveals the behavioral basis of repression—that is, when the organism must block certain types of communication between itself and its social environment, it accomplishes this by a muscular blocking within the intrapersonal system. Since this is done as if for all time, the arrangements cease to attract attention, become automatic, and so "forgotten." Attempts to modify such "stabilized battle lines," even when they are no longer relevant to the external situation, give rise to old anxieties, and in the process of dissolving a muscular block strong excitements are likely to be experienced. But with the breaking of the deadlock comes a sense of relief from a stifling restriction and the practical benefit of increased freedom and flexibility in one's activities—particularly in those involving other persons.

Procedures of the sort just described have been used increasingly by various psychotherapists and physical therapists for a number of years. Since few "normal" persons, however, have the time, money, or inclination to obtain expert help in these matters, an issue of considerable importance is the extent to which an individual, working alone, could profit from printed instructions. There is a long-standing and valid distrust of anything which smacks of "self-therapy." Such attempts to "lift oneself by one's own boot-straps" are regarded as either futile or dangerous. These objections, however, have arisen in a context where therapy is viewed as almost exclusively interpretative and verbal in its mode of operation. There is no basis for generalizing them automatically to procedures by which an individual may be assisted in making an "objective" approach to his "subjective" functioning —for instance, how he breathes, eats, talks to himself and others, emphasizes past or future, avoids certain kinds of contacts or seeks them insatiably, plays various roles with others, forces others into particular roles, and so on.

Five years ago with undergraduates in adult education, a new kind of "bibliotherapy" was tried out in the form of sets of mimeographed sheets entitled "Informal Experiments in Self-Awareness."[21] No pressure was applied to get the students to perform the experiments other than that they were required to submit occasional written reports. These went ungraded and had no bearing on the student's mark for the course. A few reports of a merely perfunctory sort were received, and there were several cases of rebellion against the whole procedure—rebellion which was allowed, of course, to succeed. In most cases, however, the students became absorbed in the work and reported varying degrees of personal benefit. Claims of "astounding self-discoveries" or "life transformed" were

[21] A version of this material constitutes the first half of the volume by Frederick S. Perls, Ralph F. Hefferline, and Paul Goodman, entitled *Gestalt Therapy: Excitement and Growth in the Human Personality*. (New York: Julian Press, 1951).

discounted unless supported by detailed statements of effects known to be obtainable when the method is employed in the face-to-face therapist-patient situation.

The original mimeographed instructions have been revised from year to year and have incorporated excerpts from the reports of previous students. More than five hundred individuals have now worked through the procedures in this fashion, with about ninety-five per cent reporting them well worth the time and effort—and without a single instance of their "dangerousness" being realized.

Recent years have also seen extensive application in group situations of role-playing procedures, both for building and for modifying the behavioral repertory. By Moreno role-playing has been elaborated into a full-bodied method of psychotherapy.[22] In his psychodramatic theater patients learn how their own behavior articulates with that of others by staging more or less impromptu plays in which they actually take the role of their own wife, or mother, or boss, or doctor. In a more conservative version role-playing has recently been installed at West Point as one of the regular training procedures for future military leaders. The cadet is required, for instance, to sample the role of enlisted man or noncom, so that later on, when in a position of command, his giving of orders and maintenance of discipline can be tempered by personal knowledge of the subordinate roles. Elsewhere, role-playing is establishing itself as a training or retraining method in classroom, in the "vestibule schools" of large corporations, and in self-organized "study groups" in various communities. This procedure is under intensive investigation, notably at the University of Michigan, as part of a general approach to "group dynamics."

It is difficult to specify what is gained from full-scale participation in social situations which cannot be gained from sideline observation, verbal discussion, or reading. Much of it is a sense of timing, the proprioceptive "feel" that goes with acting what one has previously only witnessed, the emergence of novel, out-of-character responses which surprise one, and the discovery that one can be spontaneous and yet "get away with it."

It has been known for many years that information is most readily acquired in direct contact with situations where it can be used. This has led to programs of "learning by doing" and "on the job training." In most areas, however, it is still blandly assumed that intellectual comprehension—that is, a suitable stock of verbal information—is all that is necessary to generate an adequate performance in complex practical situations. This is a stultifying hand-me-down of the earlier self-actional account of human behavior.

It is paralleled by the equally invalid assumption that, if one wishes to know something about a person's behavior, it is quite sufficient to "ask him." It is true, of course, that if the information sought lies within the area where the person has been schooled to observe himself in action and to verbalize what he is doing, his answer may be as accurate as could be obtained from prolonged observation of him by a trained investigator. But if asked about personal activities which he was never taught to observe and talk about—and therefore is likely to have no knowledge of—it is the rare individual who still does not feel qualified to answer or, if he confesses ignorance, does not feel that he *ought* to have the information. Frequently he will promise to "think about it."

[22] J. L. Moreno, *Who Shall Survive?* (Beacon, New York, 1953).

Such "thinking" is nearly certain to be of the kind which has earned the bad name of "introspection." The person stares inwardly at himself, splitting his behavior into a part which does the staring and a part which gets stared at. It is not at all surprising that whatever is observed in this peculiar state should be so distorted in the process as to be peculiar, too, and not representative of the person's behavior under more natural circumstances. In the "Informal Experiments in Self-Awareness" referred to previously, the matter is put as follows:

> . . . you will be at first unable to distinguish true awareness from introspection, and you will probably conclude that we intend you to introspect; however, this is not the case. Awareness is the spontaneous sensing of what arises in you—of what you are doing, feeling, planning; introspection, in contrast, is a deliberate turning of attention to these activities in an evaluating, correcting, controlling, interfering way, which often, by the very attention paid them, modifies or prevents their appearance in awareness. . . .
>
> Awareness is like the glow of a coal which comes from its own combustion; what is given by introspection is like the light reflected from an object when a flashlight is turned on it. In awareness a process is taking place in the coal (the total organism); in introspection the process occurs in the director of the flashlight (a split-off and highly opinionated *part* of the organism which we shall call the deliberate ego). When you have a toothache, you are aware of it without introspection, but you may also, of course, introspect it—bite down on the sore tooth, wiggle it with your fingers, or, deliberately neglecting it, force attention stoically away from it.[23]

It is commonly assumed that if a person becomes more aware of his techniques and idiosyncrasies of functioning, he will then be under the constant strain of "having to watch everything at once." Actually, it is only the person very mistrustful of himself or others—afraid of being taken by surprise—who must exercise such hyper-alertness. If a person's communication channels are open, he does not have to examine them constantly for arrival of messages. These attract attention without effort, if they involve his interests. For instance, the good driver does not need to listen deliberately to the sounds of his motor. This is in the background of awareness. But should the motor develop a knock or other noise indicating something amiss, the good driver *becomes* aware of it quickly and takes appropriate action. The same thing is true of the individual who has not been trained to be afraid of his own behavior or who, if formerly afraid, has learned the value of keeping open the channels of communication with himself.

Evidence is accumulating that the human organism, when not subjected to disruptive coercions and antibiological forcings, possesses a kind of "natural wisdom" appropriate both to intrapersonal and interpersonal functioning. It is ironical that in many respects this coincides with the announced goals of traditional training practices—consideration of others, personal resourcefulness, and diligent application to significant tasks. What has prevented an earlier realization that these are natural characteristics of *homo sapiens* has been the fact that there is nothing in such "natural wisdom" which renders it complacent with respect to sterile practices that have nothing to commend them except age, or deferential to vested interests that coast smugly on ancient victories. It is, in fact, the child's indignant resistance to "forced feeding"—the cramming into his repertory of arbitrary rules, attitudes and evaluations—that buttresses the "authorities" in their stand that the child is full of tantrums which must be conquered.

It is not intended to suggest that a human being, if let alone, would "just

[23] Perls et al., *op. cit.*, pp. 75-76.

grow" into the role of mature adult. Guidance and informed handling are obviously necessary. But in most clinical practice it has long ceased to be the task to teach the patient how to live. The job, rather, is to provide corrective experience which will in some degree repair earlier mishaps in the socialization process, remove unnecessary blocks and impediments to natural functioning, and discharge the patient with recovered ability to grow and develop.

The upshot of this whole discussion is that, in a hierarchy of communicating systems, functional integrity and health at each level can be attained and maintained only by seeing to it that the channels of communication are kept open between all levels. Disturbance anywhere affects all other parts. A boundary line of particular vulnerability has been explored—that between the overt and the covert behavior of the human organism. While privacy, in the sense of invisible behavior, will no doubt always have its merits, it will no longer need to be a reservoir for impounding the backwash of the socially inexpressible. By further development of the methods and techniques for co-ordinating the verbal and non-verbal systems which are crucial to communication "in the full human sense," it appears that man can progressively de-robotize himself and more and more take rational charge of his affairs.

OF THE PRINCIPLE OF UTILITY

Nature has placed mankind under the governance of two sovereign masters, *pain* and *pleasure*. It is for them alone to point out what we ought to do, as well as to determine what we shall do. On the one hand the standard of right and wrong, on the other the chain of causes and effects, are fastened to their throne. They govern us in all we do, in all we say, in all we think: every effort we can make to throw off our subjection, will serve but to demonstrate and confirm it. In words a man may pretend to abjure their empire, but in reality he will remain subject to it all the while. The *principle of utility* recognizes this subjection, and assumes it for the foundation of that system, the object of which is to rear the fabric of felicity by the hands of reason and of law. Systems which attempt to question it deal in sounds instead of sense, in caprice instead of reason, in darkness instead of light.

But enough of metaphor and declamation: it is not by such means that moral science is to be improved.

The principle of utility is the foundation of the present work: it will be proper therefore at the outset to give an explicit and determinate account of what is meant by it. By the principle of utility is meant that principle which approves or disapproves of every action whatsoever, according to the tendency which it appears to have to augment or diminish the happiness of the party whose interest is in question: or, what is the same thing in other words, to promote or to oppose that happiness. I say of every action whatsoever; and therefore not only of every action of a private individual, but of every measure of government.

By utility is meant that property in any object, whereby it tends to produce benefit, advantage, pleasure, good, or happiness (all this in the present case comes to the same thing), or (what comes again to the same thing) to prevent the happening of mischief, pain, evil, or unhappiness to the party whose interest is considered: if that party be the community in general, then the happiness of the community; if a particular individual, then the happiness of that individual.

Jeremy Bentham, *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation,* Ch. 1.

BENTHAM'S CRITICISM OF RHETORIC AND RHETORICIANS

Wayne E. Brockriede

I

JEREMY BENTHAM, English philosopher who lived from 1748 to 1832, was primarily a reformer of politics, legislation, and judicial procedure. He also scattered throughout his writing critical observations concerning a great many other fields. In this article, I shall present an account of his general objections to rhetoric and his criticism of specific rhetoricians.

In a letter to his father, Jeremy Bentham once indicated a youthful love for declaiming and disputing.[1] In his mature works, however, he consistently and vehemently expressed a disapproval of rhetoric and rhetoricians. He derided the "effusions of rhetoric,"[2] "rhetorical artifices,"[3] and "rhetorical flowers."[4] He frequently used the term rhetorician as a label meant to imply his disapproval. When in this mood, he contrasted statesmen with rhetoricians[5] and coupled rhetoricians with dealers in moral and intellectual poisons.[6]

What was Bentham's conception of the object of such severe disapproval? He nowhere defined rhetoric as meticulously as he did other concepts. He once called it "the art of misrepresentation—the art of misdirecting the judgment by agitating and inflaming the passions."[7] In his *Chrestomathia*, a work on useful education, he distinguished between this debased concept of rhetoric and what we would call the classical concept:

> The word Rhetoric has two considerably different significations, the one, original and unbounded; the other, derivative, comparatively modern, and comparatively narrow: the one designating the operation of speech, taken in its whole extent: the other, the art of speech considered no otherwise than as applied to the particular purpose of exercising influence over the affections and the passions.[8]

He made the same distinction when he contrasted Campbell's "unbounded" concept of rhetoric with the "comparatively narrow" treatment afforded rhetoric in "the small institutional books" which amounted to nothing more than a "string of definitions and examples."[9]

Bentham's citation of these two concepts could be merely a reflection of the climate of rhetorical thought of the time in which he wrote. William Sandford noted three rhetorical movements in eighteenth-century England: classicism (i.e., "unbounded rhetoric"), stylistic rhetoric, and the elocutionary movement.[10] When Bentham spoke of the "influence of the affections and the passions," he could have been referring

Wayne E. Brockriede (Ph.D., University of Illinois, 1954) is Instructor of Speech at the University of Illinois.

[1] June 30, 1761, cited in "Memoirs of Jeremy Bentham," *The Works of Jeremy Bentham*, ed. John Bowring, 11 vols. (Edinburgh, 1838-1843), X, 42-43. Cited below as *Works*.

[2] *The Rationale of Judicial Evidence*, in *Works*, VI, 372.

[3] *Ibid.*, VI, 406.

[4] *Chrestomathia*, in *Works*, VIII, 17-18.

[5] *An Essay on Political Tactics*, in *Works*, II, 311.

[6] *Anarchical Fallacies*, in *Works*, II, 523.

[7] Bentham's Memorandum Book, 1818-1819, cited in Bowring's "Memoirs of Jeremy Bentham," *Works*, X, 510.

[8] *Works*, VIII, 93, fn.

[9] *Ibid.*, VIII, 93, fn.

[10] *English Theories of Public Address, 1530-1828* (Columbus, Ohio, 1931), pp. 131 ff.

to either of the latter two movements, both of which designate a "comparatively narrow" scope for rhetoric. But when he spoke of the "string of definitions and examples," he seems to have been pointing to the style books on tropes and figures and not to the books of the elocutionists. His recognition of two rhetorical concepts, however, might be a more direct reference to the Ramian apportionment of the classical rhetorical canons to logic and rhetoric. Ramus was known to some extent in England during the late eighteenth century, as is shown by Bentham's familiarity with him. For example, Bentham gave Ramus credit for teaching him the dichotomous method of classification, a method that Bentham was fond of using,[11] and that Ramus discussed as an important part of his theory of dialectic.

At any rate, Bentham recognized that two concepts of rhetoric were current: the classical and the truncated. His sharp criticism is applicable almost exclusively to the latter conception.[12] This should be apparent as we examine some of the specific charges with which he indicts rhetoric.

II

Bentham seems to have despised rhetoric for four major reasons. First, he objected to what he considered the shallow substance of rhetoric. He frequently equated his disapproval of rhetoric with an approval of logic. He said of a group of writers who had proposed a penal code, "The fascinating art of *rhetoric* has obtained rather too much of their attention, at the expense of the repulsive art of logic."[13] Bentham seems to have assumed that logic had no place in the art of oratory. He contrasted the "excitements of oratory" with "logical proofs."[14] He made a distinction between the "set of noisy Orators provided for those who are more easily captivated by strength of lungs than by strength of argument" and the "Reasoners for the small number who yield only to reason."[15] It would seem that his first indictment assumes that "proof," "argument," and "reason" are unrelated to rhetoric, an assumption which would support our contention that Bentham's criticism points to a "comparatively narrow," not "unbounded," rhetorical concept.

Bentham objected to rhetoric secondly because he considered it virtually synonymous with mere stylistic ornamentation. He used the term rhetorical as a synonym of the term figurative.[16] Calling a figure of speech, "a flower of rhetoric,"[17] he defined rhetorical nonsense as "nonsense upon stilts,"[18] and he asserted that "ornament, as expressed by additional words designed for that purpose," belonged "to the head of Rhetoric or Poetry."[19] His utilitarian instincts led him to object to rhetorical ornamentation primarily because he considered it useless. The conception of rhetoric which this criticism implies is not sufficiently broad to include invention and disposition; it is, indeed, a rhetoric with excessive, if not exclusive, attention to style.

Bentham's third objection to rhetoric was based upon his belief that its usual effect was confusion. "Rhetoric," he

[11] *Chrestomathia*, in *Works*, VIII, 112.

[12] For Bentham on "unbounded rhetoric," see Wayne E. Brockriede, *Bentham's Philosophy of Rhetoric* (unpubl. diss., University of Illinois, 1954).

[13] *Letters to Count Toreno on the Proposed Penal Code*, in *Works*, VIII, 508.

[14] *An Essay on Political Tactics*, in *Works*, II, 326.

[15] *The Rationale of Reward*, in *Works*, II, 202.

[16] *Deontology*, ed. John Bowring (London, 1834), p. 213.

[17] *The Elements of the Art of Packing*, in *Works*, V, 157.

[18] *Anarchical Fallacies*, in *Works*, II, 500.

[19] *An Essay on Language*, in *Works*, VIII, 307.

stated, "very frequently attaches a meaning to . . . a word . . . which can only engender confused or mischievous ideas."[20] On one occasion, he called rhetoric the "natural style of oracles";[21] on another, he complained that rhetoricians did not "know the value of precision."[22] Believing that rhetoric increased its potentiality of confusion by being addressed typically to the imagination and the passion, rather than to the understanding, he indicted Edmund Burke for being expert "at the use of those phrases by which the imaginations of men are fascinated, their passions inflamed, and their judgments bewildered and seduced."[23]

Although Bentham disapproved of what he considered the shallowness, the useless ornamentation, and the confusion of rhetoric, he was on occasion tolerantly disposed toward it if it had no further objectionable feature. Of one of Blackstone's paragraphs, for example, Bentham wrote: "The succeeding flourish, not being designed but as an open piece of harmless rhetoric, shall have a passport."[24] But Bentham was never tolerantly disposed toward rhetoric when it embodied a fourth tendency—when it was used for the purpose of deception. Thus he denounced its "instruments of delusion";[25] he particularly deplored speakers who amplified or exaggerated their arguments; and he contended that to the rhetorician no argument was so acceptable as one "which he can make as much or as little of as he pleases."[26]

[20] *Deontology*, p. 76.
[21] *The Rationale of Judicial Evidence*, in *Works*, VII, 459.
[22] *Anarchical Fallacies*, in *Works*, II, 508.
[23] *Official Aptitude Maximized; Expense Minimized*, in *Works*, V, 283.
[24] *A Comment on the Commentaries*, ed. Charles W. Everett (Oxford, 1928), p. 188.
[25] *Deontology*, p. 144.
[26] *The Rationale of Judicial Evidence*, in *Works*, VII, 288.

III

Bentham's criticism of specific rhetoricians is sometimes interesting and almost always severe. Among ancient orators and writers on rhetoric, he discusses Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, and the Apostle Paul.

Bentham had little patience with the writing of Plato. On one occasion he accused him of being almost a fool:

> While Xenophon was writing history, and Euclid giving instruction in geometry, Socrates and Plato were talking nonsense under pretence of teaching wisdom and morality. This morality of theirs consisted in words,—this wisdom of theirs was the denial of matters known to every man's experience, and the assertion of other matters opposed to every man's experience.[27]

In another work, Bentham showered further contempt upon the pupil of Socrates:

> As to *Plato*, when in the vast wilderness of words with which, by this spoiled child of Socrates, so many shelves and so many brains have been loaded, and in which so many wits, beginning with those of Cicero, have been lost, when among all these signs, so much as a single thought, which is at once clear and instructive, shall have been pointed out, it will be time enough to steal from the examination of Aristotle's Logic, either a word or so much as a thought, to bestow upon his master's eloquence.[28]

Small wonder, then, that Bentham characterized Plato on still another occasion as "whimsical, crack-brained, but smooth-tongued."[29]

Aristotle stood much higher than Plato in Bentham's esteem. The utilitarian philosopher called Aristotle a man "of acute understanding and of an inventive genius."[30] But although he admired Aristotle, he did not revere him. The use he made of Aristotelian ideas is well described by the following statement: "In writing my Deontology,

[27] *Deontology*, pp. 39-40.
[28] *Chrestomathia*, in *Works*, VIII, 120.
[29] *Deontology*, p. 281.
[30] *Chrestomathia*, in *Works*, VIII, 120.

I took the virtues as referred to by Aristotle—traced such of them as would blend with mine, and let the rest evaporate."[31] Occasionally, his criticism of Aristotle is rather severe, as when he asserted that "Aristotle, after bewildering himself, kept the thinking part of the world bewildered for little less than two thousand years."[32]

Bentham never referred directly to Plato's rhetorical theory as expressed in *Phaedrus*, nor did he ever mention Aristotle's *Rhetoric*. However, his attitude toward other writings of the two philosophers, as well as the utilitarian and experiential nature of his own philosophic position, might suggest a strong preference for Aristotle's systematic and observational approach to rhetoric over Plato's metaphorical and absolutist approach. It is interesting to note in passing that the philosophers who drew Bentham's most consistent approval were Bacon, Hobbes, Locke, and Hartley; and this list also suggests an Aristotelian, not a Platonic, genealogy for Bentham.

The ancient rhetorician who received the most attention from Bentham, and all of it unfavorable, is Cicero. One of Bentham's references clearly and pointedly expresses his evaluation of Cicero as "That celebrated verbal florist."[33] He seems also to have thought little of Cicero's philosophy; for he asserted that the *Tusculan Disputations*, "like most of the other philosophic writings of that great master of language, is nothing but a heap of nonsense."[34]

One of Bentham's most interesting discussions of a specific speaker is his criticism of the Apostle Paul. In examining Bentham's judgment of Paul's oratory, we should note his hostility toward Pauline theology. In his *Not Paul, But Jesus*,[35] he develops three theses: (1) that Paul introduced important modifications of the teachings of Jesus; (2) that these changes were all unfortunate; and (3) that these changes have been accepted and are part of the doctrine of institutionalized Christianity. He published two other works on religion, one separately and one with George Grote, in which he further condemned the theory and practice of contemporary institutionalized Christianity.[36]

Even when read within the context of his theological opposition, Bentham's criticism of Paul's oratory is worth considering. Bentham wrote:

> When a charge made against you is true—evidence full against you, and none to oppose it, fly into a passion, magnify your own excellence—magnify the depravity of your adversaries. This mode of parrying a charge, is perfectly well understood in our days, nor could it have been much less well understood in Paul's days. . . . To the creator of Anti-Christ,—sower of tares between Pharisees and Sadducees—whatever were the charges, defence, the most triumphant, could never be wanting: arguments, suited with the utmost nicety, to the taste of judges. He would warn them against false brethren, and liars, and wolves, and children of Satan, and so forth: he would talk to them about life and death, and sin and righteousness, and faith and repentance, and this world and that world, and the Lord and resurrection: he would talk backwards and forwards—give nonsense for mystery, and terror for instruction; he would contradict every body, and himself not less than any body: he would raise such a cloud of words with here and there an *ignis fatuus* dancing in the smoke,—that the judges, confounded and bewildered, would forget all the evidence, and cry out Not Guilty through pure lassitude.[37]

[31] Bentham's conversation, cited in Bowring's "Memoirs of Jeremy Bentham," *Works*, X, 585.

[32] *Chrestomathia*, in *Works*, VIII, 110, fn.

[33] *Panopticon Versus New South Wales*, in *Works*, IV, 211.

[34] Unpubl. ms., Brit. Mus. 33.537, cited in Bowring's Note by the Ed., *Deontology*, p. 227, fn.

[35] Published under the pseudonym of Gamaliel Smith, esq. (London, 1823).

[36] Jeremy Bentham, *Church of Englandism and Its Catechism Examined* (London, 1818), and Jeremy Bentham and George Grote (Philip Beauchamp [*pseud.*]), *Analysis of the Influence of Natural Religion on the Temporal Happiness of Mankind* (London, 1823).

[37] *Not Paul, But Jesus*, p. 400.

Upon another occasion, he investigated two reports of the same event by the Apostle Paul in different Epistles and made a distinction between the "first or unstudied account" and the "oratorical or studied account."[38] He even went so far as to imply that the latter account aimed at deception.

Such is Bentham's opinion of Paul, of Cicero, of Aristotle, and of Plato. He also made critical comments about contemporary British orators and writers on rhetoric, for example, Alexander Wedderburn, Charles Fox, Edmund Burke, and George Campbell.

Of Wedderburn's gesture Bentham spoke in terms that were both playful and contemptuous:

> I was not more astonished at the brilliance of his lightning, than astounded by the thunder that accompanied it. As he stood, the cushion lay on the council-table before him. . . . I would not, for double the greatest fee the orator could on that occasion have received, been in the place of that cushion: the ear was stunned at every blow: he had been reading, perhaps, in that book in which the prince of Roman orators and rhetoric professors instructs his pupils how to make impressions. To the instrument recommended, I think by Cicero, the floor being hard, and the cushion soft, he substituted the hand. . . . Lest for making the desired impression psychological power should not suffice, he rather too often helped it out with physical, and the table groaned under the assault.[39]

The two contemporary British orators who received the most thorough critical treatment by Bentham were Charles Fox and Edmund Burke. The following passage expresses perhaps the highest praise Bentham ever accorded any well-known orator:

> Mr. Fox, the most distinguished orator of England, who attacked his adversaries with so close a logic, carried to the highest pitch the art of avoiding everything which might irritate them. In his most animated moments, when he was as it were borne onward by the torrent of his ideas, he was always master of himself, he was never wanting in the most scrupulous regard to politeness. It is true, that this happy quality was in him less a secret of the art of oratory, than the effects of the benevolence of his character. . . . Still, however, no man ever expressed himself more courageously, or less ceremoniously.[40]

But he also had occasion to disapprove of Fox, as is shown in the following passage:

> My expectations of him were never sanguine. He was a consummate party leader: greedy of power, like my old friend Lord Lansdown,—but, unlike him, destitute of any fixed intellectual principles, such as would have been necessary to enable him to make, to any considerable extent, a beneficial use of it.[41]

Bentham consistently disapproved of Edmund Burke as a man, as a political figure, and as a speaker. He considered Burke "insincere and shallow, and wholly devoid of any concern for the happiness of the people."[42] He strongly disapproved of Burke's political conservatism. Bentham charged that to Burke the subject-many were the "swinish multitude" and therefore liable to receive from him the "treatment which is apt to be given to swine."[43] As for Burke in his capacity as orator, Bentham called him on one occasion "This madman, than whom none perhaps was ever more mischievous—this incendiary." He also spoke of the "verbal filth Burke casts around him."[44] Throughout his writing, he referred to Burke as a sophist, a rhetorician, and an orator, and none of these terms did he mean as a compliment. Perhaps much of his distaste for Burke's oratory resulted from personal dislike and political opposition. But Burke may also have seemed to

[38] *Ibid.*, p. 9.

[39] Bentham's conversation, cited in Bowring's "Memoirs of Jeremy Bentham," *Works*, X, 62.

[40] *An Essay on Political Tactics*, in *Works*, II, 363, fn.

[41] Letter from Bentham to Sir James Mackintosh, 1808, cited in Bowring's "Memoirs of Jeremy Bentham," *Works*, X, 428.

[42] Bentham's conversation, cited in Bowring's "Memoirs of Jeremy Bentham," *Works*, X, 267.

[43] *The Book of Fallacies*, in *Works*, II, 453, fn.

[44] *Ibid.*, II, 465.

Bentham to symbolize certain characteristics of oratory which were opposed to his own utilitarian taste.

After discovering Bentham's stern disapproval of these men, it is novel and refreshing to find one rhetorician about whom he expressed high praise: George Campbell, author of *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*. A long paragraph which appeared in a footnote to his *Chrestomathia* is well worth study by the student of rhetoric and public address, as indicating not only Bentham's general approval of Campbell's book, but also his rather keen understanding of rhetoric in general and Campbell's rhetoric in particular. The paragraph, in part, follows:

> How narrow the conception is, which by the word *rhetoric* has been presented to the authors of the small institutional books. . . . In any one of *these* books may be seen the import of this appellation taken at its *minimum*. The *maximum* may be seen in the definition given of it, in one of the most instructive as well as most recent books on the subject—viz. *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*, by the late Dr. Campbell, of Aberdeen. In the first page of the body of the work, after having, without notice given of the change . . . substituted *eloquence* to *rhetoric*—'The word *eloquence* taken in its greatest latitude, denotes' (he says) 'that art or talent by which the discourse is adapted to its end. All the ends of speaking' (continues he) 'are reducible to four: every speech being intended to enlighten the understanding, to please the imagination, to move the passions, or to influence the will.' Thereupon, not adverting to the practice of *writing*, whether for the writer's own use, or for the use of others—whether particular individuals or the public at large, he immediately uses not only the word *speech*, but the word *speaking*, as co-extensive with and synonymous to the word *discourse*. In a Note, 'the word *eloquence*' (says he) 'in common conversation is seldom used in such a comprehensive sense.' For 'the choice made of this definition,' he thereupon gives two reasons: the second too long to be noticed here; the first is, that 'it exactly corresponds with Tully's idea of a perfect orator,' which he thereupon quotes. But in this the Christian Divine does the Heathen Philosopher much more, and himself much less than justice: for of his last mentioned *end*, viz. influencing *the will*, in comparison of which those mentioned by Tully are, all of them, but as *means*, the passage from Tully says nothing.[45]

Bentham's emphasis upon "influencing the will" anticipates the attempt by Woolbert and others to break down the distinction between conviction and persuasion and to conceive of response to persuasion as unitary. Although Bentham's psychology has been since discredited, he is modern at least in believing that the great end of rhetoric is to influence the will, and that the other three objectives mentioned by Campbell are but means to that end.

IV

Thus we may say that Bentham's view of rhetoric includes several elements. Having made a distinction between classical and truncated rhetoric, he was extremely critical of the latter—he objected to its shallowness, its ornamentation, its confusion, and above all to its deceptiveness. For these and other shortcomings he censured such prominent ancient and contemporary orators and writers on rhetoric as Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, the Apostle Paul, Alexander Wedderburn, Charles Fox, and Edmund Burke. Only George Campbell escaped Bentham's caustic criticism; and we may speculate that Campbell escaped because his was a systematic and "unbounded"—a maximal—treatment of rhetoric.

[45] *Works*, VIII, 93, fn.

THE PRESENTATION OF FIGURATIVE LANGUAGE

Carl E. Burklund

MANY years ago a freshman whose name I have ungraciously forgotten did me an immense service: he brought me down to earth with a devastating jolt. I had been aloft on the wings of song, ecstasizing over the delights of Poesy, when he burst forth, "But where does it get you anyhow?" I fell, not mortally hurt indeed, but for the moment quite shaken up. After time had drowned the memory of that insolence, I undertook to review my notion of how poetry should be taught; and in addition to being appalled at a number of things I had been accustomed to doing, I came to a quick sympathy with the spirit that prompted my student to break out so intemperately. He knew little about poetry, and I had offered him mere studio jargon. I had failed in my job, which was hardly so much to flaunt my own delight in poetry as to provide him, if I could, with the means of sharing it. A task, as every teacher knows, by no means easy.

For the difficulties of teaching poetry are many, some inherited and some inherent. In addition to the built-up prejudices of the student, there are the real difficulties in poetry itself: its form, its symbolic language, its apparently alien properties of meter and rhyme, its general—and to the student perhaps willful—technique of indirection. Much of the difficulty levels out, it is true, if only the student can hear poetry read well; he discovers to his astonishment that he understands more than he knows. But centers of resistance remain, none perhaps more stubborn than that involved in the poet's use of figurative language. Why, oh why, can't the fellow, like his even Christian, speak plain sense! Why must he call skyscrapers "frozen, simultaneous hymns to trade"? What possesses him to entitle a poem "Portrait of a Girl" when the girl simply isn't there?

It is easy for the instructor, especially if he is young and ardent, to be impatient with a student's bewilderment before mysteries even simpler than these. He may mutter to himself: but just how naive can you be! He may forget that he is the expert for whom long familiarity has made the interpretation of symbols a property of easiness. It is so common to overestimate the student's knowledge, and so fatal.

But what, then, can he do? How may he help the student to understand and so find meaning and joy in the symbolic language that is at the heart of poetry? A technique that I have used, for which I claim no merit save that it seems, moderately, to work, is roughly the following: first, to remove a misconception; second, to offer a brief sketch of the relation of art to reality and of the rationale of figurative speech; and third, to provide some elementary exercise in imaginative association. Let us consider them in that order. First, the misconception.

It is a strange and persistent fact that

Carl E. Burklund (Ph.D., Michigan, 1928) is Professor of English in the College of Engineering of the University of Michigan. *This paper was presented before the Oral Interpretation Section of the Central States Speech Association at its meeting this year in St. Louis.*

the average person regards metaphorical speech as a form of language peculiar to poets. This despite the omnipresence of slang, the transposed vocabulary of every craft, the jubilant jargon of the sports world, and the almost private idiom of students in their less academic moments. It comes to the student as something of a shock to learn that he too, in a way, is a poet, though hardly a very original one. His hot rod is a honey; his Speech course is a pipe; he ran into a friend last night, or perhaps a neat little trick (many variants); his favorite slugger hit a home run. Not one of these statements, of course, makes literal sense. But they are in their way poetic; the imaginative substitution involved does not differ in essence from that which permits Shakespeare to call life but a walking shadow or Eliot to identify fate with an Eternal Footman who holds a coat and snickers. It is not hard to gather so much evidence from the near and familiar of this love of metaphor that even the most doubting student can be shown its universality. Figurative speech is not peculiar to poetry, nor is it difficult because it is alien; it is difficult because it is more original than the stereotypes he uses.

Let us assume now that a prime misconception has been removed; we may then proceed on the difficult road of explanation. Our goal is to help clarify the nature and use of figurative language. One step in this direction may well be a comparison of art and reality, true enough yet simple enough for him to understand.

Though the approach is circuitous indeed, I start out with a few statements as remote as the following. All poetic figures are cast in the form of images; all such word images are pictures, much like those we commonly denote by that term. Now a great many pictures in this latter sense—photographs and drawings—are a faithful, "literal" reproduction of what the eye or the lens sees. Little is required in the beholder save a nod of recognition; they correspond to the real world as he knows it. The same is true of many simple word pictures; they are accurate descriptions and evoke the same response: "The pines were dark on Ramoth hill," "When icicles hang by the wall," "The lowing herd winds slowly o'er the lea." To generalize: whether etched by the pencil, the lens, or by words, such simple and direct images or pictures represent no marked alteration of the so-called real world. Our pleasure, though genuine and often very great, is dependent upon a recognition of the known. But in many pictures—cartoons, caricatures, paintings as opposed to photographs, metaphors as opposed to simple memory images—a selective rearrangement of the real has been made, so pronounced that what we encounter is a new creation, an imaginative revision of the familiar. They no longer flash so much upon the outward as the inward eye; we no longer merely recognize the known but apprehend an expanded unknown. We have left, in some vital respect, the world of reality and entered the world of art, in which by a symbol or series of symbols reality has been purposively transformed. Specific illustration can at this stage be very helpful. One may, for example, show photographs of objects and scenes painted by Van Gogh and then the artist's distorted versions of the same. And one may offer a rough parallel in language. To say, for instance, that "John is a man" is to submit something "real," like a photograph. But to say that "John is a fox," or perhaps better, a "wolf," is a purposive distortion, something like a painting of Van Gogh.

The question the student asks at this

point is, of course, why—why do the artist and the poet transform reality? And the answer is a generalization which he himself with a little thought may supply. All art, in varying ways and degrees, is a distortion of the real for the purpose of expressive statement —the expression of some truth or meaning, some significance felt within the artist but not given in the rigid minimum of the fact itself. The student, as poet, calls his car a "honey"; Van Gogh, as artist, transforms a star into an enormous whorl of light because reality is inadequate, or incapable of yielding, as it were, the "whole truth." Whether this version offered by art is ultimately a valid but different form of truth from that offered by the eye and its extension, reason, is a problem that need not disturb us nor the student. Clearly man, as artist, does to our delight and immense enrichment, so perpetually and universally rephrase the world.

The clever student will, no doubt, have been troubled by the implied congruence between the world of pictures and the world of images in poetry. Granted, he may say, that images in words are also pictures; and granted that in both categories many of them are simple statements of the "real," not "interpretations." But, what about the assumed parallel between those which do interpret? A painting, for example, or a caricature, of F. D. R., though obviously an interpretation and so different from a photograph, still looks like F. D. R. But no girl is a red, red, rose or a violet by a mossy stone, however fondly the poets insist. True—at the widest level of generalization art represents some type of selective rearrangement, but within that area there are differences. Traditionally the painter simply stylizes in terms of his own genius what he sees: El Greco's figures, though elongated and skeletal, are still human beings. Van Gogh's cypresses, though the rhythms have been heightened, are still trees. But any metaphor in verse does not simply modify a fixed image; it fuses that image with another in a different class. The union is not on the basis of outward identity but on something imagined or felt within the poet himself. It thus represents, in a fashion, a cutting free from the objective world; it represents the will of the poet to state that world in terms of his imaginative self. But it may be pointed out that metaphor has an analogue in various forms of painting and sculpture in which the work of art has no clear similarity with that which it purports to represent.

With even so limited a discussion of art and reality the student should realize that the art instinct is universal, that the urge from literal to symbolic statement is present wherever man from a deep compulsion seeks to express the quality of an experience rather than to denote its existence as a fact. With this perspective established one may rather hesitantly take the next step, namely, to present some rationale of figurative language.

I say hesitantly, for it has been my experience that one can seldom plunge into the matter directly. Repetitive though it be, one must backtrack a bit and explain in a dozen ways if possible the general function of images in poetry, of the simple as well as the symbolic. For it is never easy to make indisputably clear their reason for being. The explanation I offer is the familar one. The purpose of the poet is to communicate the feeling-tones, the quality, of an experience. He cannot do this directly, but only by offering us concrete pictures which will suggest them. To move us he must permit us to see; what we cannot visualize we cannot feel. Beauty, evil, love as abstractions have no power over

our emotions; give them local habitation and a name, and they do. This is an ancient and universal truth, known to primitive medicine men, to religious prophets, to psychiatrists, to propagandists, to cartoonists, to the canny ad men of the slick magazines, to artists and poets everywhere. We feel in particulars; we think in abstractions. We live in the specific; we reason in the general.

All images in poetry, simple and figurative, share this power: they permit us to visualize. The simple, by nature reproductions of the already known, are rarely difficult to apprehend. But the student (and ourselves, too, to be honest) often finds himself in trouble when he encounters the figurative image. What shall he do with the poet who advises him to "go and catch a falling star," or who solemnly assures him that his love for his sweetheart is an "old silver church in the forest"? There is nothing familar here in association; the statements seem both irrelevant and illogical. Some basic explanation is surely called for.

Let us start with the most immediate and the most practical aspect of the problem, the logic of that apparently illogical thing, the figurative image. And to simplify let us limit attention to those common and cognate forms, the simile and the metaphor. Each is a union of dissimilars. Obviously that union can come about in only two generic ways, the outward and the inward. That is, either the things joined, despite large difference, are in some respect alike; or if they are not, they suggest feelings within us that are. I illustrate the first when I speak of a rain of spears or find galleons in the drifting cloud shapes of a summer's day. Much of the imagery of the classical tradition, though perhaps less fanciful than the foregoing, reveals a fixed similarity between things compared. The second type of union, far more difficult and far more common in post-classical poetry, can be illustrated in the quotation from Bodenheim already given—I repeat it:

An old silver church in the forest
Is my love for you.

One can hardly doubt that love and an old silver church are disparate things; logically they cannot be compared, for they are in different categories. Yet the union is simple enough and in its way logical enough. The poet says essentially —and I put it baldly—my feeling for the church is something beautiful and tender; my feeling for you is something beautiful and tender; therefore the one equals the other. The union is based, not on what things are, but on what they make me feel. Or, to rephrase the old mathematical dictum: things emotively equal to the same thing are equal to each other. The fact that there probably never was an old silver church in a forest is a mere nothing; you can imagine it, can't you—and isn't it lovely!

This explanation, though oversimple, may be of practical aid to the student in interpreting metaphors. It clearly is no basic explanation of why they are used. But to undertake such a task would plunge us into confusion so great that we might never emerge. It might be wiser frankly to skirt this Serbonian bog and offer a not untruthful but less ambitious comment or two. It may be sufficient to expand what has already been said, namely, that direct statements and images have never proved quite adequate to express the range of experience. Neither man nor the world is simple. They have not been, and they become less so with the advancing centuries. Man cannot project the richness of life and its imaginative possibilities without metaphor and its fellows. In his desperate need to find word

equivalents for the intuitions and moods within himself he has been forced to break through literal speech and use all possible forms of analogy and symbolic identification. That he has found a measure of success in so doing is evidenced not only in the universality of poetry and other art forms but in religion as well, in which expression, out of sheer necessity, has become embedded in symbols.

If I have been guilty of evasion in the foregoing, I can at least partially compensate by pointing out an important truth that lies behind the poet's use of figurative speech—a truth that may afford a helpful perspective and lead to some practical applications. Any act or form of language is, in a way, a reduction of the world to human patterns, to human symbols. Everywhere man, the imaginative egoist, projects his own modes of consciousness into what surrounds him. Philosophies are perhaps first of all art structures of creative personalities, their "objective" truth conditioned by whether their creators are Platonists or Aristotelians; or one might add, possessed of good or bad livers. Religions are of necessity symbolic, humanized versions of our relation to God. Even science, as Bertrand Russell suggests, may rest upon metaphysical premises as subjective as any other by which we order experience.

Thus the poet is not unique; he is simply the most flagrant and the most delightful of those who humanize the world. This subjective tendency becomes clear as we examine the shift away from the simple to the figurative image in poetry. Take as an example of the simple image these lines from Browning: "The grey sea and the long black land/And the yellow half-moon large and low." Though extra meanings rush to these lines through rhythm, sound, and association, they seem most of all a direct word equivalent to reality. But as we investigate more involved images we notice a change: reality begins to yield to imagination; fidelity to the external to some insistent need within the self. The average simile represents a sort of half-way station. When it rests on some natural or easy similitude, its implicit emphasis on the self is noted only in reflection. Homer likens the campfires of the Greeks to the myriad stars of the night. The comparison is apt, but it is clear that no longer do we have mere verbal photography. Still more imaginative and hence farther away from the external is the Biblical comparison of man's life to the grass that withers in the field. Though at a philosophic distance we admit the rightness of the analogy, there is no immediate area of identity; we have taken an imaginative leap. From this point on there is no great journey to those figures which use elements of reality almost wholly as the raw stuff to symbolize the deep and fluid psyche of man. Shakespeare tells us that "ripeness is all," but the ripeness is not that of peach or grape. Stevens associates death, not with the Grim Reaper (an imaginative but simple identification), but with the Emperor of Ice Cream, and by the very illogic and grotesqueness of the equation offers an acrid commentary on the tradition that invests death, whatever the circumstance, with a comforting dignity.

This truth about figurative language, that at its core lies the impulse to express the self rather than to copy the external world, can be put to practical use. It will permit us to group and exemplify several of the large ways in which figures are employed. A simple division suggests itself. In figurative speech man may project himself into the world of nature and endow it with his own personality. Henceforth the life which he has given it seems a possession

of that world. Or he may take natural phenomena and make them symbols of his own inward states. Or he may remain in his human world and make an experience of one kind enrich or symbolize another. These divisions, as you see, are not rigidly exclusive, nor do they suggest the complexities one encounters, but they will do. Time permits only brief illustration of each.

Among whole poems Shelley's "Clouds" and Lanier's "Song of the Chattahoochie" admirably reveal the first use. In each the poet has endowed an object in nature with his own sentience, made it a human personality. Shakespeare has old King Lear cry out to the storm:

Rumble thy bellyfull! Spit, fire! Spout, rain!

Emerson uses a figure drawn from our human world to express nature:

O tenderly the haughty day
Fills his blue urn with fire.

In attributing to nature the qualities or appurtenances of man the poet follows a practice as old and enduring as the race; and it still is manifest wherever the imaginative life has not been crushed by reason. Nor is it objectionable save when so overdone as to be maudlin.

As we may project ourselves into nature, so we may use nature to express our own life and experience. A riven oak may suggest a man stricken in his prime, a gently flowing river the placid life. Shakespeare laments:

That time of year thou may'st in me behold
When yellow leaves or none or few do hang
Upon those boughs that shake against the cold—
Bare ruined choirs, where late the sweet birds sang.

And you will recall that the beautiful poem by Hopkins, "Heaven-Haven: A Nun Takes the Veil," is composed wholly of metaphors that make the outward in nature reveal the inward in man—even the title is an illustration, "Heaven-Haven."

We may pass to a third major use of figurative language, the clarification of one kind of human experience by reference to another. Arnold epitomizes a philosophic attitude in a figure drawn from human conflict:

And we are here as on a darkling plain
Swept with confused alarms of struggle and flight,
Where ignorant armies clash by night.

Whitman in "The Last Invocation" sees death as a release from a "powerful fortress'd house." Robinson Jeffers in a running analogy presents stonecutters "fighting time with marble" and the poet, who also "builds his monument mockingly." Both will be defeated,

Yet stones have stood for a thousand years,
and pained thoughts found
The honey peace in old poems.

As I come to the last section of my paper I am only too well aware of the oversimplification of which I have been guilty, and the possible much ado about the obvious. But my purpose has been to set forth as simply as I can some of the difficulties we all encounter in the treatment of figurative language, and a technique for meeting them. My last division—some exercise in imaginative association—may seem very simple indeed. Its very simplicity made me long hesitate to use it, until chance experiment convinced me that it might be helpful.

Time prevents more than a sketch of content and procedure. After a brief build-up, the purpose of which is to show how general in poetry, though scarcely so deliberate or elementary, is that kind of imaginative association in which we are now to engage, I submit a few miscellaneous words, the symbolic equivalents of which are very easy indeed, even cliché—such words as "game," "road," "battle," "stage." The least imag-

inative student can make their application to life. These may be followed by such time-honored comparisons as those represented by the seasons, by night and day, darkness and light. Most students will come up with time-honored equivalents: spring as youth, night as death, darkness as ignorance, and so on. It is often interesting to stop at this point and explore the possibilities of some one class of natural phenomena, such as trees or flowers. The oak has commonly symbolized indomitable strength in person or nation—how about the birch or willow, the elm or pine tree? The rose has been identified a million times with a pretty girl. If the identification of girls and flowers is the most common one in poetry, how about the differences suggested in the rose, daisy, violet, wild aster? If the whole business does not seem silly—which it need not—the men can have a rollicking field day, to the purely mock embarrassment of the young ladies in the class. But of course one need not and should not limit the area of exploration to nature: dynamos, pencils, airplanes, advertisements, skyscrapers, books, boxes, cars—indeed all the confused miscellany of collective life—can be drawn upon, for anything is potentially a symbol, capable of dragging a universe along with it. Sometimes the associations offered by the class will be obscure indeed, almost as stupefying as those of the contemporary poets. But that need not disturb one; there will at least be some flexing of the muscles of the imagination.

To vary the program I often pick out a key symbol-word from a famous poem, such as "fences" from "Mending Wall" by Frost. Supposing they have not read the poem (no difficult assumption), and supposing they were to write a poem with that word made into a symbol, what would they do? What extraliteral meanings could it suggest? Or I may take a figure such as Eliot's "I have measured out my life with coffee spoons," Nashe's "Brightness falls from the air," or Pascal's metaphor of man as a thinking reed. What do they make of them? How explain them? All of these are difficult, no doubt, but the students usually find them an interesting challenge, possibly (to introduce a grumpy note) because they have cut their imaginative teeth on crossword puzzles.

A somewhat different approach may be employed, one that will call for powers of discrimination. One may select a number of figures applied, say, to the ocean, and try to distinguish what different aspects or impressions have been symbolized. I give a few:

> The multitudinous laughter of the ocean waves
> In cradle of the rude, imperious surge
> The savage old mother incessantly crying.

It may be instructive as well to take examples in the same category and show the difference between a poor and a great poet's charging of a symbol. Compare the following excerpts, the first a couplet from Barry Cornwall, the second a line from Matthew Arnold:

> The sea, the sea, the open sea,
> The blue, the fresh, the ever free.

> The unplumb'd, salt, estranging sea.

In the first, practically nothing has been done with the subject. The lines have a certain freshness of movement, but the imagery is trivial, insipid. The poet has not really seen the ocean at all, or only as a fluttery girl might see it. But in the line from Arnold the ocean takes on fearful and gigantic meaning as we move from one hammer-blow adjective to the next—"The unplumb'd, salt, estranging sea."

The foregoing are offered only as sample techniques in imaginative association; others will suggest themselves. Their importance need not be over-

stressed. They can be valuable as an aid to, but hardly qualify as a substitute for, the study of images in the full context of a poem. And yet in this difficult job of teaching poetry we must count our blessings one by one and scorn no technique, however humble, that can be of use.

And now to conclude and summarize, I offer the not very original thought that there is no one, set, easy way to make clear to the student the reasons for metaphorical speech or reveal the worlds it may encompass. And yet I feel that any profitable approach cannot wisely neglect to show the relation of art to reality or fail to emphasize the common urge of poet and layman to symbolic language. In the light of such knowledge the student may see in poetic speech an extension of his own habitual practice and grow in an understanding of its similar but subtler applications. The poet should never be removed from the student; the student should be brought to the poet and introduced as a blood brother, if even a long-lost one. He shares the privilege of "seeing a world in a grain of sand/A heaven in a wild flower." He too was born in Arcadia.

FIGURATIUE LANGUAGE

> Figuratiue speech is a noueltie of language euidently (and yet not absurdly) estranged from the ordinarie habite and manner of our dayly talke and writing and figure it selfe is a certaine liuely or good grace set vpon wordes, speaches and sentences to some purpose and not in vaine, giuing them ornament or efficacie by many maner of alterations in shape, in sounde, and also in sence, sometime by way of surplusage, sometime by defect, sometime by disorder, or mutation, and also by putting into our speaches more pithe and substance, subtilitie, quicknesse, efficacie or moderation, in this or that sort tuning and tempring them, by amplification, abridgement, opening, closing, enforcing, meekening or otherwise disposing them to the best purpose: whereupon the learned clerks who haue written methodically of this Arte in the two master languages, Greeke and Latine, haue sorted all their figures into three rankes, and the first they bestowed vpon the Poet onely: the second vpon the Poet and Oratour indifferently: the third vpon the Oratour alone. And that first sort of figures doth serue th'eare onely and may be therefore called *Auricular:* your second serues the conceit onely and not th'eare, and may be called *sensable,* not sensible nor yet sententious: your third sort serues as well th'eare as the conceit and may be called *sententious figures,* because not only they properly apperteine to full sentences, for bewtifying them with a currant and pleasant numerositie, but also giuing them efficacie, and enlarging the whole matter besides with copious amplifications.
>
> George Puttenham, *The Arte of English Poesie,* ed. Edward Arber (London, 1869), pp. 171-172.

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS II AND THE REGENERATE REBELS

Huber Ellingsworth

WHILE the Southern orators who went into the North during the reconstruction period to present messages of peace and reconciliation were numerous,[1] few Yankees seem to have reciprocated. Perhaps the first Northerner to undertake such a mission to the South was John Quincy Adams II, who came to South Carolina in the autumn of 1868 at the urging of Wade Hampton. Adams' mission and its results, as a partly-forgotten episode in the story of reconstruction, will be the subject of the present paper.

In a period when Northern men were welcomed to the Palmetto State with a notable lack of enthusiasm, Hampton's invitation to Adams was unprecedented; but the political situation in South Carolina called for novel measures. To the Democrats eager to restore Southern white rule in the state, the year 1868 offered little initial promise. Their only apparent hope depended upon a victory in the April elections, when the newly-drafted state constitution, full of potentialities for graft because of its ambiguity in fiscal matters, would be submitted for ratification. Despite Democratic efforts, however, ratification was accomplished by the same landslide vote which put Radical candidates in all state offices.

By June 1, it was evident that the only genuine prospect for the Democrats lay in ending Radical Republican control in Washington. The local situation was aggravated by a split in the Carolina Democracy over a mild statement in the platform approving suffrage for negroes properly qualified by education and property ownership. The conservative element, led by Martin W. Gary, opposed any implication that negro suffrage should be encouraged, while Wade Hampton, as the moderate leader, felt that the plank might attract conservative colored voters.[2]

Though a disqualified voter in South Carolina, Hampton attended the Democratic national convention as a delegate during the first week of July. He made a seconding speech upon Francis Blair's nomination for vice-president and served on the platform committee. The Radical press, already indignant over the number of ex-Confederates attending the convention, did not let the significance of Hampton's position pass unnoticed, nor did it overlook his subsequent campaign utterances. On July 24, he spoke to a Democratic rally at Charleston, urging support of the Northern Democratic ticket. "Help them once to regain the power," he told his listeners, "and they will do their utmost to relieve the Southern states and restore to us the Union and the Constitution as it existed before the war."[3] He declared that "the Reconstruction acts are unconstitution-

Huber Ellingsworth (Ph.D., Florida State University, 1955) is Instructor in Speech at the University of Connecticut.

[1] Some of the better-known individuals who undertook such activities were Simon Buckner, John B. Gordon, Henry Grady, Wade Hampton, Benjamin Hill, Lucius Lamar, Fitzhugh Lee, Henry Watterson, and Joseph Wheeler.

[2] Hampton M. Jarrell, *Wade Hampton and the Negro* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1949), p. 27.

[3] Manley Wade Wellman, *Giant in Gray* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1949), p. 224.

al, revolutionary, and void," and described this view as "my plank in the national platform."[4]

Leading the attack against the former Confederate, *Harper's Weekly* charged that "Hampton, the rebel, and Vallandigham, the Copperhead, combined and ruled the [Democratic national] convention," and that Hampton "would like nothing better than to see the country again in arms. . . ."[5] The *New York Herald* represented Horatio Seymour, the Democratic presidential candidate, as a puppet in the hands of the Southerners, and Hampton as one of the leading manipulators.[6] Even the *Nation*, more conservative in its policy, declared that Hampton was "advocating the use of the bayonet" and preparing to break the peace over the reconstruction acts.[7]

Hampton, realizing that his name was anathema to the Democratic cause, sought a course of action which would appeal to the reasoning element in the North—he called upon Adams for aid:

> We earnestly hope that you will consent to visit us at Columbia and deliver an address to our people. . . . What stronger reply could there be to the misrepresentations of the Radicals than to hear "John Quincy Adams" talk of Union and fraternal relations on the soil of South Carolina? Your visit here, received as it would be by your people would send an electric thrill from one end of the country to the other . . . the policy of the South is peace—it is her only hope. You will see this with your own eyes and hear it with your own ears should you accept this invitation.[8]

This appeal, signed by the members of the "State Central Executive Committee," was released to the press together with Adams' reply, and was copied widely by newspapers and magazines.

Adams, brilliant son of Charles Francis Adams, had allied himself with the Democracy of Massachusetts following the war and in 1868 was a nominee for the governorship of the state. Though possessing the traditional Adams disregard for popularity, he was an eloquent speaker and delightful conversationalist, and had attracted wide attention by his sensible views on reconstruction. He was not long in responding to Hampton's invitation. His first impulse, he stated, had been to give an unqualified acceptance, but upon further consideration he wondered of what help he could be as an agent of reconciliation. He continued:

> You greatly exaggerate any influence of mine, misled doubtless by the accident of an historical name. I represent nothing in Massachusetts but a comparatively small and very unpopular minority. . . . Nothing that I could do or say if I visited you, would be likely to receive a fair or candid construction.

Not only did he doubt any salutary effect upon the North, he said, but he questioned his ability to "say those things to your people which would be delightful for them to hear or pleasant for me to speak." But after discussing the issues of secession and slavery at some length, he closed with the assurance that he would accomplish what he could by the trip, and would leave the following week for the South.[9]

The *Nation* viewed the whole proceeding with a skeptical eye. It commented: "The leading Democratic agitators at the South seem possessed with a kind of barbaric faith in symbolism, and are trying hard to help the cause by the use of tableaux vivants."[10] The *New York Times* was scarcely less vicious in

[4] Jarrell, *op. cit.*, p. 28.

[5] "At the Point of the Bayonet," *Harper's Weekly*, XII (August 15, 1868), 514.

[6] (October 5, 1868), 5.

[7] "The Week," *Nation*, VII (July 23, 1868), 63. See *New York Times*, *Harper's Weekly*, and *Nation* almost daily during August and September for editorials pointing to the presence of ex-Confederates in Democratic ranks and predicting dire consequences from their influence.

[8] *New York Times* (October 8, 1868), 1.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 1.

[10] *Nation*, VII (October 15, 1868), 302.

condemning Hampton, though it praised the sagacity exhibited by Adams' reply.[11]

Adams' first appearance in the South was at Greensboro, North Carolina, where he spent the night on his way to Columbia and addressed a standing audience from the portico of the Edwards House. Here he expressed surprise at the number of people gathered to hear him. He said that he had come South to speak of kindness, conciliation, and fraternal affection; that he had heard that the South intended to re-enslave the Negro, and if he believed this he would not have come; that he was glad to learn of the amicable relations between the races. He expressed himself as shocked at the destruction and disorder which remained three years after the war and wished that the people of Massachusetts could see what he had observed. In closing, he declared that the Constitutional party led by Seymour and Blair should be victorious; and he then "retired amid heavy applause."[12] This brief speech, serving as an inconspicuous prologue to the Columbia address, gave no hint of the intensity and frankness with which Adams would analyze sectional relations in South Carolina. Before leaving Greensboro, Adams received an invitation from the citizens of Augusta, Georgia, to address them as a part of his Southern tour, but he declined, pleading the press of previous commitments.[13]

After three days of resting and visiting in South Carolina as the guest of Wade Hampton, Adams gave his first major speech at Columbia. The address, which took place on the afternoon of October 12, was the occasion of considerable ceremony. The downtown area was hung with bunting, and crowds thronged the streets. Adams spoke from a platform in the park. Among those on the stand were Zebulon Vance, well-known North Carolina soldier and politician, and Hampton, who made the introductory speech. After an introduction in which he reviewed his long-standing opposition to slavery, Adams turned to a careful examination of the South's future. "Your permanent welfare," he said, "will depend mainly on your power to grasp firmly and embrace sincerely the fundamental principles of government as settled by the war." Adams listed these as follows: (1) the fact that every American citizen was entitled to absolutely equal rights under the law, and (2) the consideration that each citizen was the legal possessor of freedom of speech and conduct, so long as that freedom did not abridge the rights of others. He then anticipated the protest that it was difficult to consider abstract legal principles while the South struggled under the galling weight of political intemperance. It was unfortunately true, said Adams, that the North did not hold a monopoly on this extremism. "You were guilty of it when you did all in your power to rupture the union by force. We are equally guilty of it now when we will not restore the union under the terms of the Constitution because we distrust the temper of the Southern people." As for the rights of the Southern people to petition the federal government for redress of grievances, Adams reminded his listeners that they had renounced any such right by opening hostilities, seceding, forming the Confederacy, proclaiming slavery as the cornerstone of the government, and claiming to exist as sovereign states. Therefore any rights to which the South might be entitled had their existence in the contention of elements in the federal government that it was impossible for a state to secede from the Union.

[11] (October 8, 1868), 1.
[12] *National Intelligencer* (October 9, 1868), 3.
[13] *Charleston News and Courier* (October 6, 1868), 1.

Even this was a fading opportunity for the South, Adams warned, because congressional reconstruction replaced presidential reconstruction, the latter of which had held to the doctrine of the unbreakable union of states. Why had Radicals gained the ascendancy? Said Adams:

> Mainly because the extreme, impatient and fanatical portions of the governing party were enabled, partially in consequence of Mr. Lincoln's death and partially by the indiscretion of the South, to overpower the calmer and more moderate men in the party and wield its force against you. The Northern press played a vital part in promoting public acceptance of Radical policies. Every hasty word, every natural regret, every expression of pride in the memories of the old cause was carefully remembered and spread against you.

Not only were the assertions of ex-Rebels used as ammunition, Adams noted, but the very conduct of Southerners justified the extreme policies of the Radicals. He cited universal suffrage legislation as the natural consequence of the "black codes," because the North, as the liberator of the slaves, felt impelled to give the freedmen some means of defending themselves against oppressive laws. According to Adams' analysis of sectional relations, the people of the North held at least four goals on which they would insist: (1) the utter renunciation of any affection for the doctrine of secession, (2) the elimination of the last vestiges of slavery, including discriminatory laws directed at the freedmen, (3) a fair and unhampered career for the freedmen, and (4) the right of the freedmen to travel, speak, and live as they choose. To the whites as custodians of the blacks, he counseled: "It is from ignorance and inexperience that he is likely to be misled, and it is your place to protect and direct him. If he is poor and distressed, it is your duty to aid him." For both races he urged "patience and good will." The situation was difficult at best, he said; and he urged everyone to avoid complicating it by violence or deliberate misunderstanding. Adams' peroration was a plea for patient understanding:

> My friends, you must remember that confidence is at best a plant of very slow growth and when surrounded by an atmosphere so hostile as ours, the only wonder is that it is not utterly killed. You must accept things as they are. What else can you do? The idea of a second appeal to arms is madness. It is the dream of the suicide alone which could induce you to take arms against a sea of troubles, and by opposing, end them.
>
> Above all things, do nothing to render it more difficult than it now is to return to the constitutional system. Let good will and brotherly love cast out old bitterness, and let us all hasten the day when Massachusetts and South Carolina may stand once more, hand warmly grasped in hand, under the old ancestral rooftree and beneath the old flag.

Wade Hampton concluded the meeting with a short speech in which he expressed the hope that Adams would "go back and tell his people we are honest and sincere." In such a Hampton stronghold as Columbia, a guest of the popular leader could hardly do wrong, even though he was as outspoken as Adams. Both Adams and Hampton were therefore enthusiastically acclaimed.[14]

As might be expected, Adams' speech was news in the North as well as the South. The *New York Times* praised his effort, declaring that he had fulfilled the promise of his letter as "the calm and thoughtful observer, the earnest patriot, who holds party considerations subordinate to truth. . . ." The *Times* doubted, however, that his speech would have any favorable effect upon "the extremists who now control the Democratic party."[15] That the speech produced any long-range political effects

[14] *Ibid.* (October 9, 1868), 1.
[15] (October 14, 1868), 2 ff.

is to be doubted; that the Columbians listened and applauded cannot be denied.

In Charleston, the ultra-conservative center which owed little allegiance to the "liberal" Wade Hampton, Adams faced a more challenging ethical task. The Charleston *Press* had denounced his letter responding to Hampton's invitation. Nevertheless, Adams appeared on the evening of October 13 and undertook to supply a large audience with "the most unpleasant of commodities—good advice." As at Columbia, he outlined the background of the war and reminded his listeners that the congressional theory of reconstruction made them not erring brothers, but prisoners of war. He felt that the Northern and Southern people were not actually far apart in their thinking, but that each had an erroneous picture of the other. Southerners had little to gain from the election of either presidential candidate, and a Grant victory would not be as crushing as many had imagined. In any case, Adams emphasized, the South was powerless to act. He assured the large number of negroes present that they would gain far more by remaining loyal to their old friends than by listening to the promises of carpetbaggers who wished only their votes and not their welfare. While opposing universal suffrage, he advocated voting by qualified persons, regardless of race. With the extinction of slavery, the cause of ill feeling in South Carolina and Massachusetts had been removed, and only good feeling could follow. Again Hampton supplied the epilogue, describing the efforts of the Democratic state central committee to secure a visitor "who represents the views of sane men at the North." He called for, and received, a farewell ovation for Adams.[16] The *Charleston News and Courier* praised Adams editorially for his forthright analysis of issues and denied none of his premises. It felt, however, that the people were "not prepared" for what he had to say.

Not all the Northern press was so flattering in its estimate. Having now had an opportunity to read all of Adams' speeches, *Harper's Weekly* felt its initial suspicions confirmed, pointing to what it designated as contradictions in his thinking. It simply did not see how Adams could believe all his assertions and still support the party containing "all the disaffected elements of the country," a party committed to a revolutionary policy and white supremacy.[17]

Adams' trip netted him still another opportunity for a public expression of his views. While he was in South Carolina, a group of citizens of Macon, Georgia, invited him to visit their city and address the people. The letter and his response were once again made public. In his reply, Adams cited many other invitations of a similar nature which he had received and had had to refuse, as he was refusing the present one; but he said he interpreted them as an earnest desire on the part of the Southern people to express a feeling of "sincere reconciliation" between the sections. He warned once more that the Southerners must not be shocked by the Northern reluctance to accept their overtures, but must remember the circumstances under which the national rift had occurred.[18]

After spending a few more days in sightseeing as the guest of Hampton and speaking informally with Democratic and negro leaders, Adams returned to Massachusetts to renew the gubernatorial campaign. One of his first public

[16] *Charleston News and Courier* (October 13, 1868), 1 f.

[17] "More Drollery," XII (October 21, 1868), 690.

[18] *New York Times* (November 7, 1868), 1.

acts was to address a meeting of Democrats in Weymouth. He told them that he returned with the conviction that "I never intend to stop for one moment in the heartiest . . . efforts I can make to remove all such 'blessings' as Reconstruction from the necks of every one of my fellow-citizens." As he described the reconstructionists, "They have brought in a great mass of three or four million of poor, ignorant, degraded black men and set them in a row . . . across the Southern states, and because they think you cannot see the bayonets behind them they say, 'That is a republican form of government.'" "I saw no unkindness, no sort of feeling indicating unkindness toward any of the people of the North," Adams reassured the Northerners. "That they may be treated in decency and kindness they do ask," he added, "and that is what I pray every one of you to labor for."[19]

Adams' swing through the Southeast produced no major results. Ulysses S. Grant and the state Republican ticket easily carried South Carolina, and Adams lost his gubernatorial race by nearly 60,000 votes. But the opinion of historian Claude Bowers that as a gesture of reconciliation the trip "met only with jeers"[20] is probably not completely accurate. The press coverage of the *New York Times*, the *Charleston News and Courier*, and the *National Intelligencer* indicates that Adams' speeches and letters were received with a degree of appreciation by persons in the North and South. It is probable too that the appearance of a prominent Yankee, bent neither on plunder nor local office, had a salutary effect upon the thinking of the South Carolinians. The real significance of the trip, however, lies in its audacity. Adams was perhaps the first Northerner to invade the South with a reconciliatory message. His effort was directed primarily at the South Carolinians, the most ardent advocates of secession and confederation. It came barely three years after the close of the war, when the burden of congressional reconstruction was heaviest. Yet Adams' contentions that all Americans were entitled to absolutely equal rights and that the Southerners had brought much of Radical reconstruction upon themselves were met with applause rather than jeers. Far from using his visit to cement Democratic party ties at a time when the party was weak and discredited, Adams told the Southerners that they had little to gain from the victory of either presidenial candidate and that Grant might after all make a satisfactory president. His comment before an audience containing many negroes to the effect that he did not favor universal suffrage was also not calculated to win friends among the freedmen. In short, Adams was far less concerned with increasing his personal popularity or developing an aura of good feeling between the sections than with analyzing objectively what he believed to be the cause and remedy of pressing national problems. In a decade undistinguished by objective statesmanship, it was through the efforts of such men as he that extremism was replaced by a calmer approach to reconciliation.

[19] *New York Times* (October 25, 1868), 1. It is of interest to note that in addition to the press coverage of Adams' speeches there appeared a pamphlet entitled *Massachusetts and South Carolina: Correspondence between John Quincy Adams and Wade Hampton and others of South Carolina* (Boston: J. E. Farwell and Co., 1868). This publication contained both the correspondence between Adams and the committee and Adams' speech at Columbia. It is not noted in James Kelly's *American Catalogue* (New York: Peter Smith, 1938), which may indicate that it was brought out privately by Adams and not offered for sale.

[20] Claude G. Bowers, *The Tragic Era* (Cambridge: The Riverside Press, 1929), p. 233.

GROUP DISCUSSION AND ARGUMENTATION IN LEGAL EDUCATION

Donald E. Williams

I

WHEN man became interested in securing certain rights and privileges for himself and his society through governments and tribunals, the legal profession was automatically placed in a position of respect and prominence. It was Cicero who, through Crassus, appropriately asked: "What function again is so kingly, so worthy of the free, so generous, as to bring help to the suppliant, to raise up those that are cast down, to bestow security, to set free from peril, to maintain men in their civil rights?"[1] Today, with legislative and judicial bodies having become so very important in the ordering of man's life, the lawyer unquestionably performs a vital service in the functioning of the complex modern community.

The efficiency of this key profession becomes, in these circumstances, a topic of concern to lawyers and society alike. Involved in the consideration of its efficiency, certainly, is the important question of how properly to educate the lawyer-to-be. What constitutes the best legal education is, in fact, the subject of widespread current controversy. Various articles in the journals of the law profession and the law schools,[2] as well as studies sponsored by the American Bar Association,[3] attest to the fact that this is a period of careful examination and reappraisal of practices and standards in modern legal education.

No single facet of legal education is being investigated; it is the whole program that is under scrutiny. With this perspective, it is finally being recognized that pre-law-school education is an integral part of the over-all problem of training the lawyer and that the prospective lawyer's undergraduate training should be as carefully appraised as his professional training.[4] In determining the make-up of the pre-law student's college program, the contribution which Speech has to make to legal education should therefore be ascertained.

Speech and law have always been considered closely allied disciplines. The classical rhetors, holding that rhetoric was an art which could effectively energize truth, discussed extensively its ap-

Donald E. Williams (M.S., Purdue, 1951) is Instructor of Speech at Cornell University.

[1] Cicero, *De Oratore*, trans. E. W. Sutton and H. Rackham (London, 1948), I, 32.

[2] Louis L. Roberts, "Performance Courses in the Study of Law: A Proposal for Reform of Legal Education," *American Bar Association Journal*, XXXVI (1950), 17; Arch M. Cantrall, "Law Schools and the Layman: Is Legal Education Doing Its Job?" *American Bar Association Journal*, XXXVIII (1952), 907; Joseph A. McClain, Jr., "Is Legal Education Doing Its Job? A Reply," *American Bar Association Journal*, XXXIX (1953), 120; Arthur T. Vanderbilt, "General Education and the Law," *Journal of Legal Education*, IV (1952), 255; Albert J. Harno, "Legal Education: Convictions and Perplexities," *Journal of Legal Education*, I (1948), 99; Nelson G. Grills, "Pre-Legal Training," *Journal of Legal Education*, V (1952), 172; Leon Green, "Basic Training for Law School," *Journal of Legal Education*, I (1948), 273; Arthur T. Vanderbilt, "A Report on Prelegal Education," *New York University Law Review*, XXV (1950), 200.

[3] Albert P. Blaustein and Charles O. Porter, *The American Lawyer: A Summary of the Survey of the Legal Profession* (Chicago, 1954); Albert J. Harno, *Legal Education in the United States* (San Francisco, 1953).

[4] Harno, *Legal Education in the United States*, pp. 90-91.

plications to forensic speaking. From antiquity to the present day, the association between these two studies has been perpetuated. To be able to communicate with and to convince his fellows by means of the spoken word is the prime requisite of the lawyer, if it is a requisite of anyone.

Within the broad field of Speech, however, there are two areas of study which seem uniquely important to the pre-law student's training: that of group discussion and that of argumentation. To understand how these areas are closely related to the practice of law, the work of the lawyer should be compared to them.

The lawyer in many instances is the *inquirer*. Participating in co-operative group effort, he seeks in varied crises to compose differences among men; in effect, he attempts to solve problems in the most satisfactory way with the assistance of others. In other instances, when the problems of men remain unsolved after group inquiry into their nature and possible solutions, the lawyer becomes the *advocate*. In this role, he appears before those who will render the decision in the case and presents the best defense of his client's legal rights that he can.

Those who are not familiar with the character of modern pedagogy in group discussion and argumentation might ask how course work in them relates to these two important functions of the lawyer. Group discussion courses, as these are offered by the departments of Speech in our colleges and universities, feature training in the principles and methods of co-operative group inquiry into stated problems. Through study and application of theoretical principles, the student learns how problems may be so defined and delimited that there is common agreement on what the problems actually are; he learns how to detect symptoms and to determine causes of problems; he learns how various suggested solutions to problems may be appraised in the light of formulated criteria; he learns how the processes of compromise and integration may serve to secure the acceptance of these solutions and to enhance their workability. In essence, he learns how to participate as the uncommitted *inquirer* in the group process of problem solving.

In argumentation courses, sometimes called courses in debating, the concentration is on the basic principles of advocacy. The student is trained in the process of analyzing stated propositions, in methods of selecting and arranging material in constructive argument and refutation, in tests of evidence and rules of reasoning, and in factors of oral presentation. Here, the spirit of clash and the conflict of opposing contentions prevail; here, the student becomes acutely aware of the need of giving his position on the proposition *its best possible defense* before critics and judges who are also to hear a similar defense of his opponent's position.

It is apparent, therefore, that a distinct body of principles regarding effective collaborative inquiry is being evolved; the distinctive principles of argumentation have been isolated and profitably studied for centuries. Study in these areas deals with fundamental knowledge which, when functionally understood, can be employed in many specialized ways. These principles are worth anyone's careful study, but if their usefulness in professional life is ever a justification for their study, they seem a near necessity for pre-law students.

In order to discover how much training in these areas law students actually receive in their college and professional

education and to ascertain the attitudes of educators toward these areas, a questionnaire was submitted to the deans of 39 law schools and of 157 undergraduate colleges offering pre-law training. While some forms were completed by teachers and by school officials other than deans, useful replies were received from 37 of the law schools and from 141 colleges. The high percentage of questionnaires returned reflects the interest of educators in the questions under consideration here. Moreover, the number of questionnaires returned, together with the representative character of the schools submitting them, gives considerable assurance that the findings of this survey indicate the general practices and attitudes prevailing throughout the country. These findings will now be reported and examined.

II

Ninety-five per cent of the persons replying for the law schools in the survey believe that training in group discussion would be helpful to the lawyer, but none of these schools offers or plans to offer systematic study in it. Approximately half of the respondents indicate that the curriculum is too crowded to permit such an offering, while 40 per cent believe this form of training to be already sufficiently provided in such courses as "Trial Tactics" and "Legal Negotiations," and in such activities as legal aid clinics. It seems apparent, however, that this kind of training is not primarily concerned with principles and methods of group discussion but with legal procedures and practices.

Sixty per cent of the undergraduate colleges currently offer course study in group discussion. Many of those not doing so indicate that the "group discussion method" is already utilized in existing courses and duplication of training should be avoided. While no school requires its pre-law students to take a course of this nature, only 4 per cent of them believe that such training would be unhelpful to these students. The outstanding reason given for not requiring pre-law students to study group discussion is that there has been no general demand from the law schools that students take this training while undergraduates.

While none of the law schools offers study in the basic theoretical principles of argumentation, all of the participating deans and law professors except one think that such training would be helpful. The crowded law school curriculum is the reason given by 64 per cent of the respondents for not providing such training, while 44 per cent indicate that they believe the proper place for this training is in the pre-law school preparation. Eighty-one per cent of the law schools surveyed do provide for moot court activities and these offer the law students experience and training in advocacy; but only 30 per cent of the schools require students to participate in these activities. Futhermore, the emphasis in these activities is on legal procedures, not on the underlying principles of advocacy.

Eighty-seven per cent of the participating undergraduate schools offer argumentation courses, with only 3 per cent requiring the course of pre-law students. Only 3 per cent, however, think that this training would be unhelpful to pre-law students. The predominant reason given by 59 per cent of the schools for not making argumentation a required study is again the lack of demand from the law schools. In regard to extra-curricular debating in the colleges, 78 per cent of the schools represented do provide for it, but none of them requires the pre-law students to participate in it.

III

From these results, it is apparent that law students do not have the opportunity to receive training in the basic theoretical principles of group discussion and argumentation once they are in law school. The law school courses and activities which call for the application and appreciation of these principles in legal procedures are evidently offered on the assumption that the students have acquired, in one way or another, a working knowledge of these principles. Furthermore, while the law school administrators are practically unanimous in believing that study of this basic theory would be meaningful to the prospective lawyer, they regard it as a pre-law study. The standard view is that the ever-expanding field of law demands that course programs in law schools be strictly professional.

Correspondingly, most of the undergraduate college respondents believe that study in group discussion and argumentation would be helpful to pre-law students, but they hesitate to require them to take the training. The colleges await specific directions from the law schools. From the data already cited and from various comments recorded on the questionnaires, it seems highly probable that most law students thus begin their professional study without systematic instruction in group discussion and argumentation—instruction which is admittedly germane and fundamental to the study and practice of their profession.

A discrepancy exists, therefore, between what is thought educationally appropriate and what is actually practiced. The law schools are saying, "We believe that systematic study in group discussion and argumentation would be helpful for prospective lawyers but we can't provide it," while the undergraduate colleges are saying, "Most of us offer training in these studies and we too believe that it would be helpful for pre-law students, but we won't insist that they take it since the law schools have not indicated to us that it is essential." The situation is made all the more confusing when the law schools and the organizations within the law profession say: "We shall not prescribe the specific courses for a pre-law curriculum; the decision as to what it shall entail is for the undergraduate colleges and the students themselves to make. The most we will do is to make general suggestions and recommendations."[5] The vexing issue of prescription vs. non-prescription represents the crux of the problem here considered, and its many manifestations distress students and educators alike.

Albert J. Harno, Dean of the College of Law at the University of Illinois, in considering this apparent impasse between the law schools and the colleges, makes a suggestion which appears entirely tenable. He is of the opinion that though the schools cannot agree on the full content of the pre-law program, they are not thereby prohibited from prescribing certain basic skill-training courses.[6] Arthur T. Vanderbilt, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of New Jersey, is in fundamental accord with this position when he states that while any and all courses of study might be "unexpectedly useful" to the lawyer at some time, "prudence, if not the common human tendency toward the conservation of energy, would seem to dictate the advisability of preferring those subjects which have a discernible

[5] See pamphlet, *Pre-Legal Education: A Statement of Policy by the Association of American Law Schools*, which was adopted by the AALS in 1952 as its policy toward prelegal education. This statement expresses the opinion of many educators in law schools and of many members of the legal profession as well.

[6] Harno, *Legal Education in the United States*, pp. 131-132.

relation to one's future calling." He adds: "The fact that any and all knowledge may some day prove valuable should not therefore prevent us from at least indicating to the prospective lawyer what interests, what training and what subjects are most likely to aid him in law school, in his profession and his life as a civic leader."[7]

The whole question of the prescribed pre-law curriculum is not to be considered here, but it is not believed that judicious prescription of course training, to the extent that these law educators suggest, would be condemned by very many concerned with matters of legal education. Neither is it supposed that there would be very many who would not readily perceive the "discernible relation" between the training offered in group discussion and argumentation and the demands of the calling of the law. Whatever the prospective lawyer's eventual specialty, would not training in these areas provide him with an introduction to the patterns of thinking and communication which the lawyer constantly utilizes? Would not this training orient and sensitize him to the intellectual climate in which he will move, first as he pursues the study of law, and then as he functions as a member of the Bar?

The contribution which these two studies can make to legal education becomes all the more striking when the recommendations of the Association of American Law Schools for prelegal education are considered. One area in which the Association urges the pre-law student to develop proficiency in his undergraduate career is the area of "creative power in thinking." The component skills comprising this faculty are said to be:

1. Research: awareness of sources and types of material, adaptation to particular use, methods of fact presentation.

2. Fact completeness: willingness to recognize all facts, avoidance of preconception and fiction masquerading as fact, disciplined ability to withhold judgment until all facts are "in."

3. Fact differentiation: relevance of facts to particular issues, varying importance of different facts, relative persuasiveness of various facts.

4. Fact marshalling: reduction of masses of fact to manageable proportions, arrangement of facts in logical and convincing order.

5. Deductive reasoning: use of the syllogism, spotting logical fallacies, avoiding conclusions flowing from inaccurate premises.

6. Inductive reasoning: experimental methodology, accuracy of observation, elimination of variables, role of hypotheses, conditions essential to valid generalization such as adequacy of sampling, strict limitation of conclusions by available reliable data.

7. Reasoning by analogy: methods of classification, gradations of relationship, finding resemblances which justify inferences of similarity.

8. Critical analysis: disciplined skepticism in approach, thoroughness of inquiry, keenness of mind in cutting through to essentials.

9. Constructive synthesis: systematic formulation of principles, meaningful organization of ideas, structural relationship of concepts.

10. Power of decision: resolution of discoverable issues in the light of short- and long-term ends found preferable on explicitly identified and justified grounds.[8]

[7] Vanderbilt, "A Report on Prelegal Education," p. 223.

[8] Pamphlet, *Pre-Legal Education: A Statement of Policy by the Association of American Law Schools.*

The similarity between this listing of skills and the study programs in group discussion and argumentation courses is impressive. These are the very intellectual processes which these studies consider directly, not indirectly. This is not to say, of course, that these processes are not approached directly in other studies, such as logic and written composition. The unique contribution of group discussion and argumentation, however, is that they feature and emphasize the consideration of these processes as related to oral discourse and to the particular problems that effective oral communication presents. This listing as a whole provides an authentic enumeration of the key topics usually covered in lectures, readings, and classroom assignments in group discussion and argumentation course work. That such systematic training would have a meaningful place in legal education can, therefore, hardly be questioned.

IV

Realizing the potential value that systematic study in group discussion and argumentation can have for the pre-law student, we who are associated with this instruction have a real contribution to make toward the betterment of legal education. Our goals and our methods in pedagogy should be enunciated clearly and our practices should be congruous with our stated philosophy. Similarly, those who formulate the directions for prelegal education are urged to consider more seriously than they have the relationship of this training to the stated objectives for pre-law study.

RHETORIC AND LOGIC

> We conclude, therefore, that rhetoric can be no more charged with the colouring of the worse part, than logic with sophistry, or morality with vice. For we know the doctrines of contraries are the same, though the use be opposite. It appeareth also that logic differeth from rhetoric, not only as the fist from the palm, the one close, the other at large, but much more in this, that logic handleth reason exact and in truth, and rhetoric handleth it as it is planted in popular opinions and manners. And therefore Aristotle doth wisely place rhetoric as between logic on the one side, and moral or civil knowledge on the other, as participating of both: for the proofs and demonstrations of logic are towards all men indifferent and the same; but the proofs and persuasions of rhetoric ought to differ according to the auditors:
>
> Orpheus in sylvis, inter delphinas Arion.
>
> Which application, in perfection of idea, ought to extend so far, that if a man should speak of the same thing to several persons, he should speak to them all respectively and several ways: though this politic part of eloquence in private speech it is easy for the greatest orators to want: whilst by the observing their well-graced forms of speech they leese the volubility of application: and therefore it shall not be amiss to recommend this to better inquiry, not being curious whether we place it here, or in that part which concerneth policy.
>
> Francis Bacon, *Advancement of Learning*, Book II.

THE FORUM

WHAT IS NEW IN THE SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA?

The reorganization of the Speech Association of America and the revision of its Constitution are the results of thoughtful work by many different individuals over a period of several years. In 1950, because of certain immediate problems, the Executive Council appointed a Committee to study the status of affiliated organizations. (Members of the Committee: Alan Monroe, *Chairman*, Orville Hitchcock, Paul Bagwell, Wendell Johnson, W. Norwood Brigance, Loren Reid, Barnard Hewitt.)

The appointment of this Committee was probably the first step toward consideration of a new structure for the Speech Association of America. At the 1951 convention, Wilbur Gilman, in his presidential address, entitled "Unity in Diversity," proposed a plan for the reorganization of the Association. (The address was published in the April, 1952, issue of *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*.) The recommendations suggested by Professor Gilman led the Executive Council in December 1951 to appoint a Committee on Structure charged with the responsibility of studying the basic organization of the Association. (Members of the Committee: John W. Black, Hugo Hellman, Barnard Hewitt, Helen Hicks, Orville Hitchcock, Wendell Johnson, John Keltner, Ralph Nichols, M. D. Steer, Forest Whan, Claude M. Wise, Lionel Crocker, H. P. Constans, Paul Bagwell, *Chairman*.)

The Committee on Structure first reported to the Executive Council in Cincinnati, December, 1952. At that time the Committee presented criteria formulated by the members as possible guides in planning a new structure for the Speech Association of America. In essence, the criteria were as follows:

1. The plan should unify the Speech Association of America.
2. The plan should provide for wider participation of members in the operation and policy-making functions of the Speech Association of America.
3. The plan should provide for more participation by members in the planning of the convention programs of the Speech Association of America.
4. The plan should provide for more effective use of committee reports.
5. The plan should provide for the organization of committees in such a way that more active and more functional groups may be formed.
6. The plan should provide the machinery whereby any group of members with common interests may band together within the Association for study and exchange of information on common problems.
7. The plan should provide machinery whereby the Association may constantly plan for the future.

The Executive Council approved the criteria; the Committee on Structure (additional members: W. Norwood Brigance, Giles W. Gray, Franklin H. Knower, Karl R. Wallace) spent the next year in outlining a plan for the reorganization of the Association. Within the plan, provision was made for:

1. *A Legislative Assembly*—a policy-making body composed of delegates elected primarily by members of the Association.
2. *An Executive Council*—an administrative body composed mainly of officers and editors of the Association.

3. *Area Groups* organized around subject matter areas of interest and/or teaching levels.

Paul Bagwell, Chairman of the Committee on Structure, presented the plan to the Executive Council at the 1953 convention in New York. The Council approved in principle the general concept of the plan and empowered the incoming president to appoint a Committee to consider the necessary revision of the Constitution. At a business meeting of the Association the members voted to refer without prejudice the proposal of the Committee on Structure to the Committee on Constitutional Revision.

The latter Committee (Paul Bagwell, Norwood Brigance, Rupert Cortright, Wilbur Gilman, Magdalene Kramer, *Chairman*) appointed by Karl Wallace studied carefully the proposed plan outlined by the Committee on Structure and revised the Constitution accordingly. In considering revisions, members of the Committee tried to keep in mind the criteria stated by the Committee on Structure. In addition they constantly asked themselves three questions: Is the proposal logical? Is it practical? Is it feasible?

The proposed revised Constitution was published in the October, 1954, issue of *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* and in the November, 1954, issue of *The Speech Teacher*. On Sunday, December 26, 1954, just prior to the opening of the annual convention in Chicago, about fifty members of the Association discussed the proposed Constitution throughout the day and evening. Some changes were recommended and accepted. On Tuesday evening, December 28, 1954, at an open business meeting to which all interested members had been invited, the revised document was presented to the Association. Again some changes were recommended and accepted. Before the close of the meeting, the Constitution was adopted unanimously. The completed document was published in the October, 1955, issue of *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, and in the March, 1955, issue of *The Speech Teacher*.

What is now the basic organization of the Association? What major changes have been made? How will individual members be affected by the changes? The following explanation, it is hoped, will provide answers to these questions.

The purposes of the Speech Association of America remain the same as stated in the previous Constitution: "The Association is dedicated to the study of speech as an instrument of thought and of social co-operation, to the promotion of high standards in the teaching of the subject, to the encouragement of research and criticism in the arts and sciences involved in improving the techniques of speech, and to the publication of related information and research studies." The officers and editors are the same, but there is one change in succession to office; under the new plan the Second Vice-President succeeds to the First Vice-Presidency and then to the Presidency.

Three important bodies form the basic structure of the Association: (1) The Administrative Council, (2) The Legislative Assembly, (3) The Interest Groups. The responsibilities of the Executive Council under the former Constitution are now divided between the Administrative Council and the Legislative Assembly.

The Administrative Council, acting as the legal representative and the manager or the executive, conducts the business of the Association, supervises the finances, and makes final decisions concerning all expenditures of funds. The Administrative Council is a small body having only twenty-five members;

the small number was selected deliberately so that the Council may function effectively as an administrative body. The members of the Council are: the five officers—the President, the Executive Vice-President, the First and Second Vice-Presidents, the Executive Secretary; the three editors—editors of the *Speech Monographs, The Quarterly Journal of Speech, The Speech Teacher;* the five immediately past officers; the three immediately past editors; the three members of the Finance Committee; six members elected at large, two each year for a term of three years.

The Legislative Assembly has the responsibility of formulating the policies of the Association. Because of this particular function, the Assembly has a large membership (175 to 200) which is composed of members at large, representatives of geographical areas, of interest groups, of regional and national organizations. The composition of the Assembly is as follows:

1. Ninety delegates elected at large, thirty each year for a term of three years.
2. Forty-eight delegates elected from four geographical areas on ballots cast by members of the Association resident in the respective areas, sixteen each year (four from each area) for a term of three years. It should be noted that the four geographical areas do not coincide with areas represented by regional organizations; instead, they represent in general the Eastern, Central, Western, and Southern parts of the United States and Canada. Regional and state organizations may recommend any number of candidates to the Nominating Committee which in turn may select those recommended or may substitute or add other candidates to the list. A particular point to note is that members vote for *only* those candidates from their particular geographical area.
3. A representative from each interest group.
4. The Presidents and Executive Secretaries (or designated representatives) of the following regional associations: the Speech Association of the Eastern States; the Central States Speech Association; the Southern Speech Association; the Western Speech Association; and the Pacific Speech Association.
5. One member chosen for a term of one year by each of the following national organizations: the American Speech and Hearing Association, the American Educational Theatre Association, the National Society for the Study of Communication, the American Forensic Association, and other associations later recognized by the Administrative Council.

The three officers of the Legislative Assembly are: the Speaker, who is also the Second Vice-President of the Association; the Clerk, who is appointed by the President; and the Parliamentarian, who is nominated by the Executive Committee of the Legislative Assembly and elected by the Assembly.

In order to expedite the business of the Legislative Assembly, a small group functions as an Executive Committee. This Committee is composed of: (1) the Speaker, the Clerk, and the Parliamentarian; (2) the Presidents of the Regional Associations or their authorized representatives; (3) representatives of the American Speech and Hearing Association, the American Educational Theatre Association, the National Society for the Study of Communication, the American Forensic Association; (4) eight representatives of geographical areas elected by the Assembly, four each year for a term of two years; (5) four representatives of Interest Groups elected by the Assembly, two each year for a term of two years.

The primary functions of Interest Groups are to assist the First Vice-President of the Association in the planning of the annual convention program and

through study committees to achieve the purposes of the Association. The organization of an Interest Group may be initiated by a sponsoring committee of three members of the Association. (Procedures for organizing an interest group are clearly outlined in the By-Laws; official forms for organizing may be obtained from the Executive Secretary.) Before the resolution to form a new group can be submitted officially, the signatures of one hundred members of the Association must be obtained as evidence of support of the resolution. Any national association which has met with the Speech Association of America at a past convention may request the Administrative Council to approve that association as the agency sponsoring the related Interest Group. A Group may appoint committees to undertake studies or business directly related to the work of the particular Interest Group. The officials of an Interest Group are: (1) a Chairman, who presides at meetings of the Group; (2) a Vice-Chairman, who assists the First Vice-President of the Association in planning the Group's program for the annual convention, and who, after serving one year, succeeds to the Chairmanship; (3) a Secretary; (4) a delegate to the Legislative Assembly, who may be the Chairman, the Vice-Chairman, or any representative selected by the Group; (5) an Advisory Committee composed of three members; and (6) a Nominating Committee composed of five members.

The Committees of the Association are practically the same as those serving under the former Constitution, but their responsibilities are more definitely stated. The Committees whose responsibilities are largely administrative will report to the Administrative Council, and those whose responsibilities are related to policy-making will report to the Legislative Assembly. Some Committees will report to both the Administrative Council and the Legislative Assembly.

Since, after the inauguration of the new Constitution, the affairs of the Speech Association of America will be conducted by representatives of members, provision has been made for any member of the Association to bring matters of importance to the attention of the Association by submitting recommendations to the Committee on Resolutions for consideration and possible presentation as resolutions to the Legislative Assembly.

Procedures for nominations under the new Constitution are similar to those now in operation, but elections will be primarily by written ballot. There is one major change in procedure. Under the new Constitution, two candidates for the Second Vice-Presidency, for every place on the Administrative Council, for every place in the Legislative Assembly, will be nominated.

Dues for each type of membership, increased by one dollar, are as follows:

Student Membership	$ 3.50
Regular Membership	4.50
Sustaining Membership	16.00
Institutional Membership	16.00

The increase of one dollar will provide an additional sum in the annual budget to cover regular allotments to Interest Groups and extra funds for special projects undertaken by the Groups. It will also provide for larger allotments to the three publications to permit wider coverage of the activities of the Association and of the Interest Groups.

Two new types of membership are established: Emeritus and Life Memberships. Details concerning both types are stated in the By-Laws, Article I, Sections 6 and 7.

The new Constitution will become effective January 1, 1956, immediately following the convention in Los Angeles. Procedures to be followed during the gradual change-over to the new organization are described in Article XIII of the Constitution and in the By-Laws. It may not be possible to have a fully organized and functioning Legislative Assembly in Chicago in 1956, but it is hoped that by 1957 the Association will be completely reorganized and operating fully under the new Constitution.

MAGDALENE KRAMER,
Teachers College,
Columbia University

OBSERVATIONS ON "COMMUNICATION PRIMER," A FILM PREPARED BY RAY AND CHARLES EAMES

To the Editor:

No one interested in any problem of communication should miss an opportunity to see this film (16 mm., sound, color, 1953). It is a work of wide scope, extending from the simplest of visual signals through the complexity of human speech to the application of communication theory in the construction and use of modern giant computing machines. Despite this breadth, the exposition is simple, clear, and unified. The total impression is of a work of high art, in parts exquisitely beautiful.

Commencing with simple visual signals, such as storm-warnings, the film shifts through visual art-forms, introducing skillfully the concept of redundancy through a consideration of pointillism, and through noise, sound, and music to the fugue-like audible frequencies of an electric calculator. The qualities of light and motion and noise are illustrated by the sight and sound of a train going through a tunnel; and noise itself as the interruption of a signal by the sudden dropping and breaking of a plate upon the floor.

The "bit" of information is clearly explained; and redundancy in language ("The English language is about ½ redundant") is demonstrated by the possibilities of change without misunderstanding in the transmission of the alternatives "buy" and "sell" from New York to San Francisco (e.g. "sell" will still signal "sell").

The background music played by the Woodwind Quartet is by Elmer Bernstein.

No matter whether one thinks of communication in terms of human or of machine transmitters and receivers, the film should be seen.

MURRAY FOWLER,
University of Wisconsin

NOTICES OF INTENT TO ORGANIZE INTEREST GROUPS

I A Communication Interest Group will be organized prior to the 1955 Convention Program of the Speech Association of America at a time and place to be appointed by the First Vice-President of the Association.

Sponsoring Committee: Burton H. Byers, Kenneth Harwood, Thomas R. Lewis

Additional Signers: Joseph H. Baccus, Donald F. Bird, Kenneth B. Clark, Francis A. Cartier, Margaret L. Wood, Roy C. McCall, Thorrel B. Fest, Harold P. Zelko, Herold Lillywhite, Paul D. Bagwell, Ralph G. Nichols, Elwood Murray

II A Speech Science and Psychology Interest Group will be organized prior to the 1955 Convention Program of the Speech Association of America at a time and place to be appointed by the First Vice-President of the Association.

Sponsoring Committee: Orville Pence, Franklin H. Knower, Gale L. Richards

Additional Signers: William S. Howell, Stanley F. Paulson, Howard Gilkinson, William W. Fletcher, Donald K. Smith, Robert T. Oliver, Bert Emsley, John Dietrich, Iline Fife, S. M. Vinocour, Harold E. Nelson, Dale D. Drum, Ray S. Ross, E. S. Carter, W. W. Hamilton, W. E. Utterback, Keith Brooks, Karl R. Wallace, W. H. Yeager, Halbert E. Gulley, John Black, John J. O'Neill, Marie Hochmuth, Henry W. Moser, Wayne E. Brockriede, Paul Carmack, Wallace Fotheringham, Norman W. Freestone, Donald E. Sikkink

III A General Semantics Interest Group will be organized prior to the 1955 Convention Program of the Speech Association of America at a time and place to be appointed by the First Vice-President of the Association.

Sponsoring Committee: Elwood Murray, Paul Bagwell, W. Charles Redding

Additional Signers: Elton S. Carter, Elizabeth Carr, Wendell Johnson, Ralph Y. McGinnis, W. Arthur Cable, Loren Reid, Seth Fessenden, John W. Keltner, William V. Haney, Warren C. Thompson, Barnard J. Knittel, James H. Platt

IV A History of Speech Education Interest Group will be organized prior to the 1955 Convention Program of the Speech Association of America at a time and place to be appointed by the First Vice-President of the Association.

Sponsoring Committee: Edyth Renshaw, Giles Wilkeson Gray, Bert Emsley

Additional Signers: Harold Weiss, Franklin H. Knower, William E. Utterback, Everett M. Schreck, Paul Carmack, John T. Rickey, Douglas Ehninger, C. W. Edney, Francine Merritt, Charles A. Parker, Jack M. Carter, C. M. Wise

V An Undergraduate Instruction Interest Group will be organized prior to the 1955 Convention Program of the Speech Association of America at a time and place to be appointed by the First Vice-President of the Association.

Sponsoring Committee: Donald E. Hargis, A. L. Thurman, Jr., H. L. Ewbank, Jr.

Additional Signers: Mildred F. Berry, Atwood Hudson, W. Charles Redding, Alan W. Huckleberry, William M. Perkins, R. A. Johnston, S.J., Virgil A. Anderson, Roberta M. Buchanan, D. C. Dickey, H. P. Constans, Charles W. Lomas, Waldo W. Phelps, Tom Rousse, H. W. Townsend, Bower Aly, Loren Reid, Solomon Simonson

VI A Secondary School Interest Group will be organized prior to the 1955 Convention Program of the Speech Association of America at a time and place to be appointed by the First Vice-President of the Association.

Sponsoring Committee: Evelyn Konigsberg, Oliver W. Nelson, Waldo W. Phelps

Additional Signers: Charles L. Balcer, Mary Blackburn, Hayden K. Carruth, Lawrence S. Jenness, Freda Kenner, Yetta Mitchell, Bea Olmstead, Mrs. O. J. Whitworth, Gladys L. Borchers, Thomas A. Rousse, Zelda Horner Kosh, Karl F. Robinson

NEW BOOKS IN REVIEW

LELAND M. GRIFFIN, *Editor*

ON GOOD WRITING

Harold F. Harding

Books Surveyed:

1. ON PHILOSOPHICAL STYLE. By Brand Blanshard. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1954; pp. 69. $1.00.
2. THE MAGIC OF WORDS. By The Rt. Hon. Lord Justice Birkett. London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press, 1953. pp. 15. 2s net.
3. GUIDE FOR AIR FORCE WRITING, Air Force Manual 11-3. By the Department of the Air Force. Washington, D. C.: 1954; pp. 133. (For use by USAF officers and Air Force ROTC cadets; not sold publicly.)
4. HOW TO MAKE SENSE. By Rudolf Flesch. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954; pp. 202. $2.75.
5. PLAIN WORDS: THEIR ABC. By Sir Ernest Gowers. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1954; pp. vii+298+viii. $2.50.
6. The essays on Language, Rhetoric, Sign and Symbol in GREAT BOOKS OF THE WESTERN WORLD. In vols. 2 and 3 of 54 vols. Edited by Robert M. Hutchins. Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., 1952.
7. GROWTH AND STRUCTURE OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE. By Otto Jespersen. Ninth Edition. Garden City, New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1955; pp. vi+274. $0.95.
8. KNOW YOUR READER: THE SCIENTIFIC APPROACH TO READABILITY. By George R. Klare and Byron Buck. New York: Hermitage House, 1954; pp. 191. $2.95.
9. RECURRENT MALADIES IN SCHOLARLY WRITING. By Eugene S. McCartney. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1953; pp. xi+141. $2.50.
10. THE CONCISE USAGE AND ABUSAGE. By Eric Partridge. New York: Philosophical Library, 1954; pp. ix+219. $3.50.
11. ASPECTS OF READABILITY IN THE SOCIAL STUDIES. By Eleanor M. Peterson, Ph.D. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1954; pp. ix+118. $3.50.
12. ON THE ART OF WRITING. By Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1943; pp. xiii+302. $3.00.
13. UNUSUAL WORDS AND HOW THEY CAME ABOUT. By Edwin Radford. New York: Philosophical Library, 1946; pp. 318. $3.75.
14. CLEAR WRITING FOR EASY READING. By Norman G. Shindle. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1951; pp. vii+176. $3.50.
15. THE ETHICS OF RHETORIC. By Richard M. Weaver. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1953; pp. 234. $3.50.
16. IDEAS HAVE CONSEQUENCES. By Richard M. Weaver. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1948; pp. 190. $2.75.

Mr. Harding (Ph.D., Cornell University, 1937) has been Professor of Speech at Ohio State University since 1946.

What are These Books and Articles About?

"Take care of the sense and the sounds will take care of themselves," says Alice of *Alice in Wonderland*. And she would be delighted to discover the vast energy now being spent by governments, businessmen, the military, scientists, and scholars to follow her advice. The books listed above represent a sampling of efforts by various writers dedicated to what Jacques Barzun calls this "modern crusade for plain words." He dates it from Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch's series of lectures (12) delivered at the University of Cambridge in 1913-14. But literary historians know that the struggle for perspicuity has long occupied writers on rhetoric and language. Publishers are once again organizing and mass-producing for various markets the do's and don't's that an avid public demands.

All these studies (1-16) have the cen-

tral objective of getting ideas as exactly as possible out of one mind into another. But they vary in their content and their methods. Lord Justice Birkett (2) is addressing teachers of English. He believes that good English depends "upon two main things—the right choice of words for the particular purpose in hand, and the placing of words so chosen in their right order." Old-fashioned as this approach may be, it seems to permeate in one way or another the organized suggestions of most other writers. What makes the attainment of good writing so difficult is that different people react differently to a writer's conceptions of right words and right order. This conflict between the writer's ability and the reader's knowledge or intelligence has encouraged "the scientific approach to readability." Messrs. Klare and Buck (8) have given us a review of the findings of the readability experts, some 194 of them, in an eleven-page bibliography. Dr. Flesch, Viennese lawyer turned researcher and writer on clear writing and children's reading, promulgates in *How to Make Sense* (4) a new (second revised) readability formula. It measures *r* and *e* which mean roughly "realism" and "communicative energy."

Dr. Peterson reports on a study (11) of 99 tenth-grade history students and their understanding of textbook materials. Her researches have implications for textbook writers, teachers, and reading specialists. She tested passages from history books for main ideas, inferences and relationships, vocabulary, and details.

Norman Shindle's *Clear Writing for Easy Reading* (14) is a practical how-to-do-it book. Its chapters read like digests of other books. The sentences are short, and the advice is usually supported by examples.

At a much higher level Brand Blanshard (1), Professor of Philosophy at Yale, is concerned with improving philosophers as writers. He wants them to throw out their jargon, cut down their excessive generality, and to pay attention to the rhythmical structure of sentences. Is this formula easy to attain? No, indeed. "We may have to agree with Professor Raleigh that 'to write perfect prose is neither more nor less difficult than to lead a perfect life.'"

In a class by themselves are the works by Eric Partridge (10), Sir Ernest Gowers (5), and Edwin Radford (13). After a fashion they follow the lines of H. W. Fowler's famous *Modern English Usage*, but all three authors lack Fowler's punch and wisdom. Whereas Partridge and Gowers deal with correctness of use, Radford has simply compiled a dictionary of odd words and phrases paying special attention to their origins.

Jespersen's famous *Growth and Structure of the English Language* was first published in 1905 when it won the Volney Prize of the Institut de France. Now available as a paperbound book (7) it should attract readership beyond the circle of specialists in the English language. It has long been standard fare for the historian of English and the philologist.

The philosopher and the rhetorician will find special delight in Richard M. Weaver's two books (15, 16). His chapter (in 15) on "The Rhetoric of Social Science" contains a valuable analysis of such questions as: Does the writing of social scientists suffer from a primary equivocation? Do the social scientists lose more than they gain by a distrust of metaphors? And is the expression of social scientists affected by a caste spirit? As may be surmised, the author provides "yes" answers and supporting reasons

for them. *Ideas Have Consequences* (16) was published in 1948 and is included in this review mostly because of its provocative chapter on "The Power of the Word."

The *Guide for Air Force Writing* (3) is another specialized publication for officers having to learn or relearn the intricacies of staff studies, directives, and reports. Its chapters on "Putting Your Ideas Across" and "Editing and Criticizing Copy" draw upon the studies of Flesch, Dale, and McElroy.

Dr. McCartney's *Recurrent Maladies in Scholarly Writing* (9) is intended mainly for professors. At least his experience as editor of scholarly publications for the University of Michigan Press over some thirty years has been gained at the expense of the hundreds of manuscripts written by professors and graduate students. In 150 pages devoted to learned and witty chapters ranging from "The Studied Avoidance of Simplicity" to "Some Participles I have Met," Dr. McCartney drives home the points that the "low level of scholarly writing" can be attributed to insufficient linguistic training, haste, working under pressure, carelessness, distraction, and delegation of work. The charm of this urbane book is to be found in the scores of "horrible" examples the author provides from his own editorial files. Every scholar should have a kinder feeling towards good editors after a tour of the McCartney morgue.

The last items in this *mélange* have probably escaped most teachers of speech. This may be due to their unavailability and their high cost. For the most part sets of the *Great Books of the Western World* (6) are to be found only in the larger libraries. Volumes Two and Three constitute the Syntopicon or Index to the 102 Great Ideas. The essays in these volumes dealing with Language, Rhetoric, and Sign and Symbol which we touch upon should be familiar to all advanced students of rhetoric. Why? Because they reveal in documented form the profound concern of the great thinkers of the Western World with communication in its broad sense. Following each essay dealing with a "Great Idea," the editors have provided all the pertinent references in the fifty-four volumes to such topics as these:

For "Language":

- The spoken and the written word in the development of language.
- The abuse of words: ambiguity, imprecision, obscurity.
- Grammar and rhetoric: the effective use of language in teaching and persuasion.

For "Rhetoric":

- The devices of rhetoric: figures of speech, the extension and contraction of discourse.
- The use of language for persuasion: oratorical style.
- Examples of excellence in oratory.

For "Sign and Symbol":

- The conventional notations of human language: man's need for words.
- The patterns of meaning in human discourse.
- The use of metaphors and myths in science and philosophy.

The random topics above are but a few of the dozens that will capture the attention of devoted students of writing and speaking. For each topic and subtopic we discover exact references in the pages of the *Great Books*. Under the heading of "The Canons of Excellence in Style" following the essay on Rhetoric, for example, there are a hundred or more references to the works of some twenty-two authors from Aristophanes to William James. Freud and James, by the way, are the two most recent writers included in the fifty-four volumes.

How Useful Are These Works?

If we read the publisher's paragraphs on the jackets of some of these books, we are assured that success in writing is but a matter of "a few easy lessons." Dr. Flesch's book (4) even proclaims "how improvement in speaking, reading, and writing can be a means to a better way of life for you." But anyone who has attempted to direct a doctoral dissertation from choice of topic to and through a reading committee knows the agonies of producing a single chapter, or a single paragraph, or even (alas, all too often!) a single sentence. The sad fact is that good writing is seldom produced in a first draft. Or in a second or third. Put another way, all writing can be improved by careful reading, excision, and a better choice of words and phrases. Poor writing like some diseases can usually be treated only by major surgery.

Are these books good for the "surgeon" to study? Of course they are. Some are better in the early stages of his training. Some may be used after experience in writing. Some are "post graduate" in nature. Still others like those by Gower, Partridge, and McCartney are good to have at one's elbow during the process of revising.

But it is silly to think that the reading or even the thoughtful and repeated study of any of the books listed at the head of this essay will produce better writers per se. Why not?

Can Good Usage and Good Style in Writing and Speaking be Taught?

If the answer to this question is a flat "no," we teachers who have been making a living in the attempt to teach good habits had better seek other jobs. Fortunately, we all know of "improvements" some students are able to make in a four-year period, or in a year's time, and occasionally in a single course.

A large-scale "scientific" analysis of exactly how a student's improvements in writing and speaking are attained remains to be undertaken. Is a better style due to a student's high motivation, a teacher's gift for exposition and correction, or merely because of the student's own persistent dissatisfaction? Or possibly the passage of time and a fresh appraisal of what one has written? We teachers often like to take credit for the new skills which students may well acquire without our help.

The truth is that knowing how to improve your skill in writing is a lifelong occupation. Every writer worth serious study is constantly trying to do better. What are some of his ways of self-evaluation and self-improvement? Much has been collected and written by Gorham Munson and others on this subject. For each generation the advice has to be revived and re-learned.

I list below some postulates that seem to me important for teachers, students, writers, and readers to bear in mind when they discuss the problem of whether good style can be taught. Some of these statements are in one sense of the word *postulate* assumed "without proof to be true." We need systematic studies to determine whether they are true. We need to *know*, in fact, much more than we think we know just how good writers and good writing are produced.

Some Postulates

1. *Good writing is not entirely a matter of complying with formulas, "fog counts," or "yardsticks."*
2. *Good writing depends on more than knowing your readers; we cannot ignore the subject, or the standards of usage and good taste.*
3. *Good writing like good acting or good markmanship comes only after*

much practice and repeated efforts to perfect the separate skills.

4. *Imitation of good models is a valuable means of teaching the separate skills (e.g. choice of words, use of force, emphasis, and smoothness).*

5. *The processes of rewriting (correcting, condensing, vivifying, simplifying, amplifying, adapting to particular readers or hearers) are probably the most effective methods for beginners to master.*

6. *Mastery of the technical rules of composition is in itself no assurance of skill in writing; invention, arrangement, and style ultimately depend on the mental abilities and literary aptitudes of each individual.*

These few statements may be sufficient to support the view that a great measure of what is important in writing and speaking must be attained perhaps with the guidance of a teacher but more often by the hard ways of experience. I mean through trial and error, experiment and evaluation.

We know, for example, that Lincoln greatly improved his style after hearing William H. Seward speak in 1848. And the beauty of the Gettysburg Address did not bloom in the first draft. Nor did the great majority of Americans recognize the literary excellences of that masterpiece in the year in which it was delivered.

The good writer is far more than a word-and-phrase technician. He is an artist, his personality—all that he is and has learned—bursts forth with every paragraph. Adlai Stevenson, to be specific, could never write Harry Truman's memoirs, and Harry Truman couldn't conceivably have written Adlai Stevenson's 1952 campaign speeches.

Style in writing and speaking may indeed be acquired without the aid of "how to" books and even without the aid of teachers of composition. Far better it is to have the advice of editors and critics. And a good mind to begin with is always helpful. Shaw and Winston Churchill and Faulkner, among modern writers, are prime examples of craftsmen largely self-taught. Could any teachers or books on "readable writing" or "plain talk" have advanced them? I doubt it.

Present-day publishers by their advertising often make us believe their handbooks alone will create writers. If this were possible, I would hasten to tell every graduate student to spend $100 for a collection of the six Rudolph Flesch books and two-dozen others. But honesty compels me to counsel the earnest student to invest a small fraction of that sum in fresh supplies of paper, good pencils, erasers, and a first-class dictionary. Then I add: "Practice, Practice, Practice."

"Proper words in proper places" is still a good definition of style, as is "Le style est l'homme même—The style is the man himself."

I agree with the writer of the *New York Times* editorial (April 21, 1955) who believes that "just ordinary straightaway English is high talent, and exceptionally straightaway English is straightaway genius."

[CICERO] AD C. HERENNIUM DE RATIONE DICENDI (RHETORICA AD HERENNIUM) WITH AN ENGLISH TRANSLATION. By Harry Caplan. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1954; pp. lviii+434. $3.00.

Professor Caplan's disciples and friends have long known of his intention to make the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* available in original text and English translation in the Loeb series. The volume now under review represents the gratifying fulfillment of that intention: and at

the same time it stands as a major achievement in the history of rhetorical scholarship.

The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* has three distinctions for students of the Latin rhetorical tradition. As the earliest complete Latin rhetoric to have survived in entirety, it reduces to a unified system the divergent Greek theories that had preceded it—theories originating with Isocrates and Anaximenes, with Plato and Aristotle, with the Stoics and Epicurus and Hermagoras. Secondly, it stands beside Cicero's earlier but less complete *De Inventione* as the first formulation of the rhetorical theory that was to become the standard doctrine of the whole Roman era and was to be finally perfected in the mature Cicero's *Orator* and *De Oratore* and in Quintilian's monumental *Institutio Oratoria*. Thirdly, as a textbook in Western Europe during the Middle Ages and Renaissance, when other Latin and Greek rhetorics had been partly or entirely forgotten, it can be called the chief instrument in carrying the old rhetoric of the Mediterranean World into the developing Atlantic community of nations and into universities with the new names of Paris, Cambridge, and Harvard.

Despite these distinctions, the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* has had an uneven history. Composed somewhere between 86 and 82 B.C., it dropped out of sight almost at once and appears to have remained in oblivion until the middle of the fourth century A.D.—a span of five hundred years. When that lengthy eclipse had ended, the treatise was accepted at once by Jerome and others as the work of Cicero, and for the next thousand years it remained in the Ciceronian canon, a circumstance which did nothing to decrease its reputation. Shortly before the discovery of America, it was proved not to be the work of Cicero, but the exact identity of its author has never been established. It was translated into Italian and into French during the twelve hundreds, into Spanish during the fourteen hundreds, into German during the eighteen hundreds, and into English during the nineteen hundreds. Professor Caplan's version is the only complete one to have been published in our language.

The inventional theory of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (and of the somewhat older *De Inventione*) teaches a speaker to seek oratorical subject matter by searching among the kinds of oratory, the parts of an oration, and the elaborate *status* system presumed to underlie all rhetorical controversies. That inventional theory had an immense vitality. It was still being taught almost in its original form in Western European schools and universities of the seventeenth century, and fragments of it can be found today in textbooks on writing and public speaking. It has had a profound effect upon the composition of such literary works as sermons, lectures, histories, and expositions, no less than upon political and legal orations. The modern student who wishes to familiarize himself with that inventional doctrine as an important branch of Western literary theory could not do better than read Professor Caplan's fine translation and be repeatedly instructed by his learned and exact notes upon the origin and meaning of its individual teachings.

In the other standard aspects of Latin rhetorical theory, the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* can also be read as one of the best and certainly one of the most influential of all the works of its kind. Its theory of rhetorical arrangement shows the earliest signs of the weakness that developed as Latin rhetoric tried to treat the six parts of an oration under inventional theory and tried at the same time to reserve something significant to say about arrangement when that subject was treated as the second major aspect of rhetoric. This very weakness is visible sixteen hundred years later in one of the first of our English rhetorics, that by Thomas Wilson in 1553; and it is visible in Wilson because one of his most important sources is the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. The theory of oratorical delivery, with its division into vocal quality and physical movement, can be understood more fully in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* than in most other classical rhetorics, and echoes of its teachings are found in medieval textbooks, in Renaissance manuals, and in present-day treatises on reading and speaking. The ability to memorize, so useful to the speaker, and so distinct an object of Latin rhetorical training, was reduced to a system for the first time in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. That system taught the speaker to remember ideas and words by associating them with a series of prearranged images stored in a prearranged network of places or backgrounds. So popular was this theory that it not only persisted into the Renaissance in Wilson's *Arte of Rhetorique* and in other rhetorical works but it also served in Stephen Hawes' *Pastime of Pleasure* (1509) as the basis for teaching poets how to remember the verses they might want to repeat to gatherings of nobles. As for the theory of oratorical style, the most extensive division of Latin rhetoric after invention, the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* divides it

into the three kinds (grand, middle, and simple) and into the three qualities (taste, artistic composition, and distinction). The three kinds of style are explained as practically in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* as in any Latin treatise; and under the third of the three qualities of style, it analyzes and illustrates forty-five figures of diction and nineteen figures of thought, this whole doctrine being responsible for dozens of medieval and Renaissance works on the schemes and the tropes.

In sum, the reader of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* comes in contact with the persistent units of the Latin theory of rhetorical arrangement, style, memory, and delivery, as well as invention, while the reader of Professor Caplan's expertly annotated translation comes also in contact with the whole ancient history of these five great concepts of rhetorical theory.

In his Introduction Professor Caplan gives an excellent judicial review of disputed points in the scholarly writings upon the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. Thus he deals with the question of authorship of the treatise; with its date of composition, its sources, and its history in manuscript and printed book; with the age, politics, and philosophy of its author; and with the relation between it and Cicero's *De Inventione*. These and other problems are treated by Professor Caplan with great economy and learning. There is no doubt that his Introduction will remain the best authority on these subjects for a long time to come.

All students of rhetorical history must consider this volume an indispensable addition to their personal libraries. Scholars in related fields and well-informed general readers interested in literary theory will also want to possess it. Student and general reader alike will find it an excellent corrective for some of our narrow and stereotyped modern conceptions of rhetoric.

WILBUR SAMUEL HOWELL,
Princeton University

WILLIAM ELLERY CHANNING. By David P. Edgell. Boston: The Beacon Press, 1955; pp. xv+264. $4.00.

The author's purpose is twofold: "first, to reintroduce Channing as a man of his times, not as the spectral figure the hagiographers have made of him; and, second, to determine as far as possible the nature of his thought and its relevance to the problems of his age and ours." Although the publisher's jacket describes the book as the "first full-scale biography in 50 years," it is really not that. Rather, it consists of a series of critical essays which examine Channing's thought. After a rapid summary of the larger details of Channing's life, essays are devoted to the religious philosophy of Channing, his link with the transcendentalists, his views of reform, his excursion into critical writing. A few pages are devoted to a final assessment of his significance.

The problem of dealing with Channing is, according to the writer, "one of selection," since there are "enough materials in the three volumes of the *Memoir* to construct the lives of half a dozen men." One does not read very far until he begins to wonder whether or not the writer's determination to remove the halo from his subject has not, in fact, warped his selection of materials considerably. That the writer has not determined "as far as possible the nature of his (Channing's) thought" becomes all too apparent when one compares sections in the present volume devoted to Channing's religious philosophy with the superbly perceptive and complete treatment of the same subject accorded by the philosopher Robert Leet Patterson in the recently published *The Philosophy of William Ellery Channing* (Bookman Associates: New York, 1952).

One also questions the criteria for determining the "relevance" of Channing's thought "to the problems of his age and ours." I suspect that the modern sociologist concerned with interpreting problems resulting from industrializing would be far less distressed by the "unreality" and "innocence" of Channing's "inveterate tendency to regard people as members of different social groups rather than as individuals" than is the author of the present volume. And the historian, aware of the complexity of the problem of isolating the "causes" of war, would not be so ready to ascribe a lowly place to a man for his failure "to realize completely the true nature of its (war's) causes" or to provide "convincing leadership in the agitation for peace."

It is very likely that the writer would have come off considerably better in his appraisal had he been willing to accept the fact that Channing "regarded himself first and foremost as a Christian minister" and to use standards appropriate to the subject. He might then have placed in perspective peripheral activities that engaged some of Channing's attention. Occasionally the writer attempts

the communicative effectiveness of Channing by reference to Emerson and other contemporaries. One wonders by what evidence he would have been led to such conclusions as the following: "the older man scorned the affective use of language. He was concerned primarily with lucidity, Emerson with stimulating his audience"; and again, Channing was "never to achieve the eloquence of a William Lloyd Garrison." Usually the writer appears to be applying the criteria of poetic to rhetorical discourse.

Perhaps nowhere is the inadequacy of standards for evaluation more apparent than in the concluding chapter dealing with Channing's significance. One finds such confusing appraisal as the following: "The real question is not whether Channing was a primary figure. Admittedly, he was not. He instigated no movements, but the nature of his thought gathered no disciples, brought about no reforms. . . . In spite of his timidities and hesitations, the great mass of people both in this country and in Europe thought of him as a great liberal leader. The precise, practical results of Channing's influence cannot be measured."

The book is a readable account of one of the "puzzling" figures of the nineteenth century, but one feels after reading it that the puzzle has not really been solved.

MARIE HOCHMUTH,
University of Illinois

HOOF BEATS TO HEAVEN: A True Chronicle of the Life and Wild Times of Peter Cartwright, Circuit Rider. By Sidney Greenbie and Marjorie Barstow Greenbie. Penobscot, Maine: Traversity Press, 1955; pp. xx+623. $6.00.

Speaking at the jubilee celebration in 1869 to honor his fiftieth consecutive year as a presiding elder of the Methodist Church, Peter Cartwright reminisced nostagically about his boyhood adventures in "dark and bloody" Kentucky. "I have no language to describe to you the situation of this frontier country. I could tell you a thousand tales that you would not believe of the scenes through which I have traveled."

Hoof Beats to Heaven, the first of a projected three-volume biography of Peter Cartwright, attempts to fill this language void. The task is difficult, partly because the eighty-four year old backwoods preacher, displaying a rare touch of modesty, misrepresented his own rhetorical prowess. Any biography of this eccentric, colorful itinerant must face the stimulating challenge of surpassing the parson's *Autobiography*, truly a frontier classic. Mr. and Mrs. Greenbie were perhaps wise, therefore, in employing a narrative style. With unusually powerful, telling force the authors brilliantly dramatize this frontier saga; yet they insist that their account rests on well-authenticated sources and careful documentation. Even so, a reader may suspect that this work, like Cartwright's *Autobiography*, contains more filler than fact. The bibliography, currently available to "any scholar sincerely seeking to check on our research," will be revealed with the publication of the final volume.

This large book covers barely sixty pages of the Cartwright *Autobiography*, also a large book (over 500 pages). The chronicle begins in 1783 with a sketch of the courtship, marriage, and migration of the circuit rider's parents to Amherst County, Virginia, where two years later, Cartwright was born, unattended, during an outlaw raid. He was scarcely six years old when his father caught the Kentucky fever, and moved his family to the Military Tract of that new Canaan which John Filson described as "flowing with milk and honey." The Cartwrights soon discovered that this terrestrial paradise was a haven for murderers, fugitives, horse thieves, highway robbers, and counterfeiters, and the center of an undeclared war between the "Rogues" and the vigilantes, known as the "Regulators."

Greatest value of this volume lies in the vividness with which the authors portray the barbaric conditions invariably interwoven with great mass migrations, particularly to an unbroken wilderness, cut off from churches, schools, and adequate government. In an area generally neglected by contemporary historians, the authors picture accurately the role played by the Methodist circuit rider, the Baptist farmer-preacher, and the Presbyterian schoolmaster in helping to bring order out of frontier chaos. The Methodists receive primary emphasis in their additional endeavors to reconcile a democratic gospel with a dictatorial church government, their indefatigable race to keep abreast of the westwardbound pioneer, their adoption of the camp meeting as the most efficacious frontier agency for socio-religious propagation, and their successful bid for the mind and heart of a wild, spirited youth destined to become the West's most picturesque preacher.

Doctrines, techniques, and preaching methods typical of the Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians, and the mushrooming religious "isms" which flourished in this primitive country form a substantial part of the narrative. But since

the account closes just as Peter Cartwright starts on his sixty-nine year peregrination as a circuit rider, rhetorical insights relative to his pulpit oratory and political stump speaking must await succeeding volumes.

PAUL H. BOASE,
Oberlin College

MAKING DEMOCRACY A REALITY: JEFFERSON, JACKSON AND POLK. By Claude G. Bowers. Memphis: Memphis State College Press, 1954; pp. ix+170. $3.75.

The books of Claude G. Bowers, if taken with the proper grain of salt, are profitable reading. Basically, Bowers is correct in most of his historical interpretations, but he is so strongly partisan that he constantly overstates. When William E. Dodd many years ago pronounced Bowers' *Jefferson and Hamilton* "the most interesting book ever written on the struggle between" the two men, he did not applaud it for many other qualities. To praise his hero, Jefferson, Bowers painted Hamilton as black as the ace of spades. Again, in Bowers' *The Tragic Era,* he tells as almost no other writer has ever done the viciousness of the Radical Reconstruction policy of Congress toward the South, but a Charles Sumner, for instance, is made more of a villain than he actually was.

In *Making Democracy A Reality,* which is a series of four lectures on Jefferson, Polk, and Jackson, delivered in 1953 at Memphis State College under the sponsorship of the J. P. Young Lectures in American History, Bowers follows the same pattern. All three men are lectured upon as American heroes. Their virtues were numerous, their vices few. What is said of Jefferson does not go beyond previous writings by Bowers on him. Likewise, Jackson is probably not interpreted any better than in what was done by the author in *Party Battles of the Jackson Period* several years ago. Nevertheless, *Making Democracy A Reality* is well worth the time of the reader, and certain of its virtues deserve recognition.

Perhaps the chief contribution of Bowers is his approach to and interpretation of James K. Polk. In recent years Polk has come to assume mightier proportions. Historians are rapidly including him among our great—or near great—Presidents. Bowers joins in the rising chorus of acclaim toward Polk and attempts an answer to the question: "Why Was He One of the Greatest American Presidents?" In brief, Polk is treated as the man who, in four years, succeeded in what his predecessors failed to accomplish: annexation of Texas, settlement of the Oregon claims, acquisition of California, the lowering of tariff duties to a revenue basis "just to both the farmers and manufacturers," and the creation of a subtreasury to "put an end to the financial chaos and the bank controversy." The Whig opposition was constant and incessant, but Polk triumphed so that in Bowers' words, "Few Presidents can duplicate his record. Jefferson alone has stamped his name on so much American geography."

Two lectures are devoted to Jackson. One is entitled: "His Substitution of Party Government for Personal Politics," and the other, "The Homeric Battles of His Administration." Of more than passing interest to the student of public address is the treatment of the first Jefferson dinner at which Jackson drew the battle line with Calhoun by his toast: "Our Federal Union—it must be preserved." For pen portraits in rapid fashion of such personages of Jackson's Kitchen Cabinet as William B. Lewis, Amos Kendall, and Isaac Hill, and for the account of the addition to the group of Francis P. Blair and the founding of the Washington *Globe,* the reader is indebted to Bowers for some pages of choice writing. Jackson is pictured as winning his battles for preserving the Union, for increasing American prestige in Europe, and for making "good the Jeffersonian formula of equal right with special privileges for none."

DALLAS C. DICKEY,
University of Florida

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON AND THE HUMANITARIAN REFORMERS. By Russel B. Nye. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1955; pp. vii+215. $3.00.

The nineteenth century suffered no insufficiency of "idiosyncratic, unpredictable" characters—the kind Governor Adlai Stevenson described in his commencement speech at Smith when he begged the girls to be more "ornery." Of all the bizarre personalities produced during the middle period, none was more dedicated or fanatical than William Lloyd Garrison, editor of the *Liberator,* and "whip-master general" of the antislavery movement. Though known primarily as an abolitionist, Garrison jousted valiantly against "cock-fighting, liquors, war, and 'infidelity,'" as well as slavery.

In this brief account, the eighth volume in Oscar Handlin's Library of American Biography, Mr. Nye, head of the English department at Michigan State University, outlines Garrison's noisy career from poverty-harassed boyhood to

unexpectedly tranquil old age. Though he recounts in great detail the tedious, if not to say interminable, in-fighting between antislavery societies, he leaves a description of Garrison, the personality, to a brilliantly-written "Epilogue," the most useful and readable chapter in this competent but sometimes undistinguished book. Indeed, he contributes little to the much-needed re-evaluation of Garrison's role in the antislavery movement—a role which unfortunately has been minimized by Gilbert H. Barnes (*The Anti-Slavery Impulse*) and others. Certainly not all students of the period would agree, for example, that "had Garrison never existed things might have been much the same." Throughout, Nye carefully catalogues the New England editor's ineptitude and irascibility, but he fails to explain his dynamic persuasive power and vitality. Perhaps this failure stems from the author's seemingly studied attempt to avoid a discussion of his subject's attributes as editor and speaker.

Garrison is, of course, a fit subject for penetrating psychological analysis; but unhappily the exciting facets in a study of fanaticism do not concern the author here, though he certainly presents the raw materials for such a study. Garrison is described as "a revolutionary individualist" whose approach was "visceral, emotional," a man violent in both speech and print, yet a devoted "non-resistant Pacifist" firmly opposed to all forms of physical force. In discussion, according to Emerson, he "neighed like a horse." "Arrogant" and "dictatorial," he refused to countenance "the gradual abolition of wickedness." Indeed, he welcomed martyrdom. When jailed in Boston, he thought it "a blessed privilege thus to suffer for Christ." Hisses, he said, were music to his ears. "Some of us," the eager martyr once wrote hopefully, "will be assassinated or abducted."

In this age of conformity and genuine intellectual timidity, it is refreshing to read of individualists who grapple manfully with ideas and who welcome strenuous verbal combat. William Lloyd Garrison and the humanitarian reformers are representative of an age when men (and a few strong-minded women) were bold enough to say what they believed even at a considerable personal sacrifice.

ROBERT G. GUNDERSON,
Oberlin College

ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE. By Fola and Belle Case La Follette. Two vols. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1953. Pp. xxiii + 1,125. $15.00.

Many are the psychological and sociological studies of war propaganda and war hysteria. Approximately one-fourth of the text in this long two-volume biography may be considered a case study in this field. Robert M. La Follette was not a pacifist, but he opposed our entering World War I. He supported legislation for its conduct, but he consistently opposed measures that he felt belied the principles of democracy and such idealistic war aims as President Wilson's Fourteen Points. He fought for higher taxes on war profits, and he opposed United States adherence to the League of Nations without drastic reservations.

He was not alone in these positions, but as the recognized long-time leader of the progressive bloc in Congress he was most widely publicized.

He was most bitterly criticized for his leading the so-called filibuster against the armed ship bill requested by Wilson in the closing hours of the 64th Congress and for his extemporaneous address to a mass meeting of the Nonpartisan League in St. Paul, September 20, 1917. For these he was attacked in the press, from the public platform, and in the halls of Congress in a torrent of now almost unbelievable vituperation. For sixteen months a resolution of expulsion from the United States Senate was actively in the hands of the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections.

For a vivid, yet objective, presentation of those days and events, this biography of "Fighting Bob" La Follette offers absorbing reading. Many facts not previously authoritatively known are revealed from the voluminous La Follette Papers, opened for public use only after these volumes were published. They have been exhaustively checked with the manuscript papers of various other leaders of the time, including Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, W. J. Bryan, Robert Lansing, Ray Stannard Baker.

Such precautions are doubly necessary when a public man's biography is written by his wife and daughter. The first twenty-six chapters are by Belle Case La Follette, covering the period 1855 to 1910. Her work on her husband's life was cut short by her death in 1931. From that point on, covering about three-fourths of the two volumes, Fola, the eldest child of the La Follettes, is the author. Her work has been painstaking, as evidenced by voluminous footnotes. There is no break in style or in narrative as she carries on from where her mother left off. Fola is treated as the man who, in fourth

because he fears, in view of its authorship, that it will be a mere eulogy. Naturally, it presents La Follette in a different light from what a hostile critic might; but on the whole it seems to this reviewer to be refreshingly objective. An example of unfavorable material that might have been omitted is the quoted personal attack by La Follette on Senator Frank Kellogg in 1922, which Mrs. La Follette is recorded as having deplored as unworthy. (pp. 1063-4).

This objective treatment is noticeable, too, in the handling of the celebrated and much discussed La Follette-Theodore Roosevelt rivalry for the Presidential nomination in 1912, to which seven or eight chapters are devoted. The story is similar to that found in *La Follette's Autobiography*, but some sources not available to the Senator in 1912 throw added light on the events.

Of particular interest to students of public address is the discussion of La Follette's unfortunate speech before the Periodical Publishers' Association at Philadelphia, February 2, 1912, which proved disastrous to the Senator's chances of being the united progressive candidate against Taft for the Republican nomination. Although the most painstaking preparation of content was La Follette's habitual practice, here was a case where he spoke against his better judgment, when he had not adequate time to prepare, when he was dog-tired and under heavy emotional strain because of his younger daughter's serious illness. The author makes no attempt to gloss over the abysmal failure of this speech in its presentation and effect.

Aside from his personal journal, *La Follette's Magazine*, used like Bryan's *The Commoner* to supplement the owner's speaking, it was by the spoken word in Congress and on the chautauqua and lyceum platform that he carried his progressive principles and program to the American people. Ironically, however, it was in two speeches, those at Philadelphia in 1912 and at St. Paul in 1917, where he spoke extemporaneously or without adequate preparation for the specific occasion, that he did his cause and himself the greatest harm. He "always dreaded making a speech which he had not had time to prepare carefully."

The treatment in the two volumes is chronological, proceeding from La Follette's boyhood in rural southern Wisconsin to the quiet close of a turbulent life in 1925. The [illegible] twenty years of service in the Senate and the independent progressive candidacy for President in 1924, move many of the leaders of national life as associates and as supporters or opponents of the progressive principles for which La Follette fought throughout his life. Sometimes political opponents were nevertheless good personal friends, as in the case of Senators Boies Penrose and George Moses.

In both events and personalities the entire La Follette family shares. His wife the Senator called his "wisest and best counselor," and the four children were usually included in political discussions. Bob, Jr. became his father's secretary in 1919. Small wonder, then, that the biography contains great numbers of excerpts from family letters. These, together with the inclusion of countless small, familiar incidents, show a warm, human side of "Battling Bob" that will prove a pleasant surprise for many readers.

These volumes stand as a valuable contribution to the study of the "Wisconsin Idea" and the "Progressive Era," and a stimulating biography of their most influential figure, whose faith in the common people when given the facts was a consuming passion.

A detailed index adds to the usefulness of the volumes.

CARROLL P. LAHMAN,
Pasadena College

JOHN HART'S WORKS ON ENGLISH ORTHOGRAPHY AND PRONUNCIATION [1551 · 1569 · 1570], Part I, Biographical and Bibliographical Introductions, Texts and Index Verborum. By Bror Danielsson. Stockholm: Almquist & Wiksell, 1955; pp. 338.

Of the two minor diseases prevalent among those who dabble in phonetics—belief that phonetic study began with the concoction of the International Phonetic Alphabet and belief that it ended there—this resurrection of Hart's works is an antidote for the first. Serious students of the development of English phonology or of phonetic alphabets have always known Hart. He is one of the two sixteenth-century "phoneticians, grammarians, and spelling reformers" named by Jesperson as the most valuable authorities. The other, Sir Thomas Smith, had as his object "to improve the orthography not explain the pronunciation," as Ellis put it. His *De recta et emendata linguae anglicae scriptione, dialogus*, 1568, had no more [illegible] Hart's [illegible] words [illegible] phonetic alphabet. [illegible] described [illegible] as [illegible] with extensive

unexpectedly tranquil old age. Though he recounts in great detail the tedious, if not to say interminable, in-fighting between antislavery societies, he leaves a description of Garrison, the personality, to a brilliantly-written "Epilogue," the most useful and readable chapter in this competent but sometimes undistinguished book. Indeed, he contributes little to the much-needed re-evaluation of Garrison's role in the antislavery movement—a role which unfortunately has been minimized by Gilbert H. Barnes (*The Anti-Slavery Impulse*) and others. Certainly not all students of the period would agree, for example, that "had Garrison never existed things might have been much the same." Throughout, Nye carefully catalogues the New England editor's ineptitude and irascibility, but he fails to explain his dynamic persuasive power and vitality. Perhaps this failure stems from the author's seemingly studied attempt to avoid a discussion of his subject's attributes as editor and speaker.

Garrison is, of course, a fit subject for penetrating psychological analysis; but unhappily the exciting facets in a study of fanaticism do not concern the author here, though he certainly presents the raw materials for such a study. Garrison is described as "a revolutionary individualist" whose approach was "visceral, emotional," a man violent in both speech and print, yet a devoted "non-resistant Pacifist" firmly opposed to all forms of physical force. In discussion, according to Emerson, he "neighed like a horse." "Arrogant" and "dictatorial," he refused to countenance "the gradual abolition of wickedness." Indeed, he welcomed martyrdom. When jailed in Boston, he thought it "a blessed privilege thus to suffer for Christ." Hisses, he said, were music to his ears. "Some of us," the eager martyr once wrote hopefully, "will be assassinated or abducted."

In this age of conformity and genuine intellectual timidity, it is refreshing to read of individualists who grapple manfully with ideas and who welcome strenuous verbal combat. William Lloyd Garrison and the humanitarian reformers are representative of an age when men (and a few strong-minded women) were bold enough to say what they believed even at a considerable personal sacrifice.

ROBERT G. GUNDERSON,
Oberlin College

ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE. By Fola and Belle Case La Follette. Two volumes. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1953. Illustrated. $10.00.

Many are the psychological and sociological studies of war propaganda and war hysteria. Approximately one-fourth of the text in this long two-volume biography may be considered a case study in this field. Robert M. La Follette was not a pacifist, but he opposed our entering World War I. He supported legislation for its conduct, but he consistently opposed measures that he felt belied the principles of democracy and such idealistic war aims as President Wilson's Fourteen Points. He fought for higher taxes on war profits, and he opposed United States adherence to the League of Nations without drastic reservations.

He was not alone in these positions, but as the recognized long-time leader of the progressive bloc in Congress he was most widely publicized.

He was most bitterly criticized for his leading the so-called filibuster against the armed ship bill requested by Wilson in the closing hours of the 64th Congress and for his extemporaneous address to a mass meeting of the Nonpartisan League in St. Paul, September 20, 1917. For these he was attacked in the press, from the public platform, and in the halls of Congress in a torrent of now almost unbelievable vituperation. For sixteen months a resolution of expulsion from the United States Senate was actively in the hands of the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections.

For a vivid, yet objective, presentation of those days and events, this biography of "Fighting Bob" La Follette offers absorbing reading. Many facts not previously authoritatively known are revealed from the voluminous La Follette Papers, opened for public use only after these volumes were published. They have been exhaustively checked with the manuscript papers of various other leaders of the time, including Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, W. J. Bryan, Robert Lansing, Ray Stannard Baker.

Such precautions are doubly necessary when a public man's biography is written by his wife and daughter. The first twenty-six chapters are by Belle Case La Follette, covering the period 1855 to 1910. Her work on her husband's life was cut short by her death in 1931. From that point on, covering about three-fourths of the two volumes, Fola, the eldest child of the La Follettes, is the author. Her work has been painstaking, as evidenced by voluminous footnotes. There is no break in style or in narrative as she carries on from where her mother left off. Bob is treated as the man who, in fourth

because he fears, in view of its authorship, that it will be a mere eulogy. Naturally, it presents La Follette in a different light from what a hostile critic might; but on the whole it seems to this reviewer to be refreshingly objective. An example of unfavorable material that might have been omitted is the quoted personal attack by La Follette on Senator Frank Kellogg in 1922, which Mrs. La Follette is recorded as having deplored as unworthy. (pp. 1063-4).

This objective treatment is noticeable, too, in the handling of the celebrated and much discussed La Follette-Theodore Roosevelt rivalry for the Presidential nomination in 1912, to which seven or eight chapters are devoted. The story is similar to that found in *La Follette's Autobiography*, but some sources not available to the Senator in 1912 throw added light on the events.

Of particular interest to students of public address is the discussion of La Follette's unfortunate speech before the Periodical Publishers' Association at Philadelphia, February 2, 1912, which proved disastrous to the Senator's chances of being the united progressive candidate against Taft for the Republican nomination. Although the most painstaking preparation of content was La Follette's habitual practice, here was a case where he spoke against his better judgment, when he had not adequate time to prepare, when he was dog-tired and under heavy emotional strain because of his younger daughter's serious illness. The author makes no attempt to gloss over the abysmal failure of this speech in its presentation and effect.

Aside from his personal journal, *La Follette's Magazine*, used like Bryan's *The Commoner* to supplement the owner's speaking, it was by the spoken word in Congress and on the chautauqua and lyceum platform that he carried his progressive principles and program to the American people. Ironically, however, it was in two speeches, those at Philadelphia in 1912 and at St. Paul in 1917, where he spoke extemporaneously or without adequate preparation for the specific occasion, that he did his cause and himself the greatest harm. He "always dreaded making a speech which he had not had time to prepare carefully."

The treatment in the two volumes is chronological, proceeding from La Follette's boyhood in rural southern Wisconsin to the quiet close of a turbulent life in 1925. The [illegible] twenty years of service in the Senate and the independent progressive candidacy for President in 1924, move many of the leaders of national life as associates and as supporters or opponents of the progressive principles for which La Follette fought throughout his life. Sometimes political opponents were nevertheless good personal friends, as in the case of Senators Boies Penrose and George Moses.

In both events and personalities the entire La Follette family shares. His wife the Senator called his "wisest and best counselor," and the four children were usually included in political discussions. Bob, Jr. became his father's secretary in 1919. Small wonder, then, that the biography contains great numbers of excerpts from family letters. These, together with the inclusion of countless small, familiar incidents, show a warm, human side of "Battling Bob" that will prove a pleasant surprise for many readers.

These volumes stand as a valuable contribution to the study of the "Wisconsin Idea" and the "Progressive Era," and a stimulating biography of their most influential figure, whose faith in the common people when given the facts was a consuming passion.

A detailed index adds to the usefulness of the volumes.

CARROLL P. LAHMAN,
Pasadena College

JOHN HART'S WORKS ON ENGLISH ORTHOGRAPHY AND PRONUNCIATION [1551 · 1569 · 1570], Part I, Biographical and Bibliographical Introductions, Texts and Index Verborum. By Bror Danielsson. Stockholm: Almquist & Wiksell, 1955; pp. 338.

Of the two minor diseases prevalent among those who dabble in phonetics—belief that phonetic study began with the concoction of the International Phonetic Alphabet and belief that it ended there—this resurrection of Hart's works is an antidote for the first. Serious students of the development of English phonology or of phonetic alphabets have always known Hart. He is one of the two sixteenth-century "phoneticians, grammarians, and spelling reformers" named by Jesperson as the most valuable authorities. The other, Sir Thomas Smith, had as his object "to improve the orthography not explain the pronunciation," as Ellis put it. His *De recta et emendata linguae anglicae scriptione, dialogus*, 1568, had no more [illegible] than Hart's [illegible] with extensive

illustration, and if he, by title and in fact, concerned himself with the abuses of conventional orthography, he also did much more than that.

The three works reproduced here are: a manuscript of 1551, *The opening of the unreasonable writing of our inglish toung,* 232 pages in manuscript, 48 large pages here; *AN ORTHOgraphie, conteyning the due order and reason, howe to write or paint thimage of mannes voice, most like to the life or nature,* 1569, 78 leaves octavo, 57 pages here; *A Methode or comfortable beginning for all vnlearned, whereby they may bee taught to read English, in a very short time, vvith pleasure,* 1570, 20 leaves quarto, 17 pages here.

The first work was intended for printing but has never before been printed in full. Ellis identified the manuscript as Hart's on 28 Oct. 1868, after his comment on Hart in the first volume of his *Early English Pronunciation* was in type; he printed some portions in his third volume. Jesperson, without giving consideration to Ellis's analysis of the manuscript, dismissed it as "the first imperfect draught of his *Orthographie.*" It is both less and more than that. It has not much been made use of.

The *Orthographie* was printed with the first part in ordinary spelling and the last part, 47b-67a and index table in what we would now call phonetic transcription. Ellis calls this second part "the earliest connected specimen of phonetic English writing which I have met up with," and Jespersen has it "the longest connected phonetic text printed before Sweet's *Elementarbuch"* of 1886. (Butler's *English Grammar,* 1633, and the 1634 edition of his *Feminin' Monarchi'* might be thought to qualify as phonetic texts.) In 1850 Pitman reprinted the *Orthographie* from the British Museum copy C.57a.35, which Danielsson considers the best of the nine copies known to him and makes the basis for his text, with the first part in shorthand and the second part in facsimile writing. Ellis reprinted the last chapter, with minor modification of symbols. Extracts have been reprinted elsewhere.

The *Methode* is, as the full title states, a primer, including tabular arrangements for exposition and drill and specimens in Hart's phonetic spelling. Ellis did not know of this work; Jespersen knew only the British Museum copy, acquired in 1895. Danielsson uses as basis for his text the one other, better, copy he knows of, now in the Folger Shakespeare Library.

Much use has been made of Hart's works, principally the *Orthographie* and lately the *Methode,* by writers in the field from Bullokar, 1580, to Kökeritz, 1953. There has been controversy as to the worth of the phonetic analysis and as to the standard of speech represented. Ellis, apparently following Gill, and others following Ellis have considered the work "most disappointing" and the author a Welshman. Jespersen was a whole-hearted admirer. He published in *Anglistische Forschungen* in 1907, after failure of the Early English Text Society to provide funds for an edition, a substantial essay on the reliability of Hart's works and extended word lists, *John Hart's Pronunciation of English (1569 and 1570).* He says: "Hart . . . deserves a place of honour as the best representative in the sixteenth century of good, educated English Pronunciation." Kökeritz, "John Hart and Early Standard English," in *Philologica: The Malone Anniversary Papers,* 1949, recognizes the worth of the phonetic analysis but points out the evidence of a Devonshire substratum in Hart's pronunciation.

This is not the place, however, for criticism of Hart's contribution. That may more appropriately be done when Danielsson's projected second volume, comprising the phonology, appears. I comment only on what Danielsson has done in this volume.

The texts are preceded by 108 pages of biographical and bibliographical introduction and followed by eighty-five pages of index. The biographical introduction, which includes in thirty-one appendices the pertinent documents, with translation where needed, and is accompanied by seven facsimile reproductions, is a most impressive bit of scholarship. It is the sort of thing Kökeritz was asking for, even though it may not add materially to the evidence Kökeritz already had for dialectal provenience. The detail is exact and elaborate. The bibliographical introduction is compact, technical, exact. The index verborum "includes, as far as possible, all the words found in phonetic transcription in John Hart's works." The purpose and arrangement of this index is quite different from that of Jespersen's word lists and the indexing exact, to page or leaf and line, instead of general. One might wish that Danielsson had used Jespersen's simple O and M to specify *Orthographie* and *Methode* rather than the cumbersome H1569 and H1570.

The texts themselves are excellently printed, with marginal annotations as appearing in the originals and with detailed collation in footnotes. There are sixteen facsimile reproductions of pages from the first printing including the

pages from the *Methode* which contain pictures not reproduced in the new text. It is of course impossible to check the accuracy of the reproduction except for the pages corresponding to the facsimile reproductions, but everything about the book gives one confidence in Danielsson.

There is one marked defect in the format. It is probably the best arrangement to print in run-on text with the page breaks of the original indicated by parenthetical boldface page or leaf numbers, the latter with the usual recto and verso markings. But there are no running heads anywhere in the book and when one opens to a page, whether thumbing through or working from the index, he finds no mark to indicate which work he is looking at and has to hunt for the original pagination to which the index refers.

A word of caution should be added for the casual reader. In an inconspicuous paragraph near the end of the introduction Danielsson explains that he has replaced the special symbols which Hart invented for those "carecters or letters" not found in the ordinary font of a sixteenth-century typesetter with IPA or other present-day symbols. (Here the one error I have noticed, omission of the long *s*.) In this he had Jespersen for precedent and the device is probably as good as any. But the reader ought not to think that Hart preinvented IPA in IPA form. The forms of Hart's special symbols can be seen in blown-up size in the facsimile key charts accompanying the reprint of the *Methode* and can all be found in running text in the reproduction of leaf 47b of the *Orthographie*, which fortunately faces the page on which Danielsson's reprint of that leaf appears with substitutes.

In making Hart's works generally available, Danielsson has done a great service for those who are interested in the pronunciation of early New English and unable to get at the originals. It is mildly interesting that this reprint comes out two years after Shipman's dissertation on the work of the French phonetician Meigret, whose publications of a decade earlier apparently furnished Hart a model. Hart mentions Meigret as one "huoz resons and arguments ei du hier-befōr partlei-iuz."

LEE S. HULTZÉN,
University of Illinois

THE TEACHING OF MODERN LANGUAGES. A volume of studies deriving from the International Seminar organized by the Secretariat of UNESCO at Nuwara Eliya, Ceylon, in August, 1953. Paris, France: UNESCO, 1955; pp. 294. $2.50.

Out of UNESCO's seminar in far-off Ceylon in August, 1953, has come this book of general significance to all members of the speech profession and of prime importance to those who in one way or another have developed concern for the teaching of English as a second language.

To this seminar from eighteen nations came forty scholars who are specialists in the teaching of modern languages. Directed by Dr. Theodore Andersson of Yale University, the seminar included as the other American a linguistic anthropologist from the University of Chicago, had able representation from France and the United Kingdom, but was particularly representative of those countries in Asia and the Middle East where new emphasis is being placed upon the acquisition of a second language.

The generous scope, if not the depth, of the discussions of the seminar is suggested by the chapter headings: The humanistic aspect of the teaching of modern languages, The teaching of modern languages as a key to the understanding of other civilizations and peoples, The methodology of language teaching, Audio-visual aids, The psychological aspects of language teaching, The training of modern language teachers, Textbooks, The teaching of modern languages by radio and television, Modern language teaching in primary schools, Special aids to international understanding, Teaching modern languages to adult migrants, and Special problems of language.

Except for the final chapters, each chapter consists first of the seminar report upon this topic and then of several papers (or of important excerpts from papers) prepared by seminar members. This arrangement effectively presents the group viewpoint along with amplifications or, sometimes, modifications by those with special concern for a particular problem or special competence in dealing with it.

To those of us whose concern with a foreign language has been dominated by the meretricious motive of meeting a graduate school requirement this book should have rich meaning, especially at this time when the decline in interest in foreign languages seems to be offset by a new wave of concern apparently driven by a deep and abiding purpose. It is difficult to read this book without being impressed by the high potential for international

understanding existing in good teaching of a major foreign language.

This book has special value for the increasing number of speech teachers who as consultants, clinicians, or instructors are involved in the teaching of English as a second language. In many speech clinics, for instance, there turn up foreign students who are referred because of difficulty with English speech sounds and intonations. But this book frequently points out that the older concern with phonetics as such is being displaced by attention to the phonemic problems. Phonetic problems occur within a phonemic context; they are part of the larger difficulty of acquiring habitual behavior within the structure of the foreign language.

Particularly also is this publication a desideratum for anyone anticipating assignment abroad to teach English as a second language or to help prepare foreign speakers to teach English in their own countries. A recent article in *QJS* observed that few speech people had received grants for study or lecturing abroad, probably because of the lack of specific speech curriculums there, but that some opportunity for foreign assignment does exist in the programs for the teaching of English. Most relevant is the insistence to be found in this book that the present-day instructor in a foreign language can not rely upon traditional methods but must base his instruction upon sound linguistic knowledge and training in the structural approach developed during the past fifteen years.

This reviewer, who had the privilege of a Fulbright grant to Egypt last year as linguistic consultant to the ministry of education, feels that good as this book is, its value to readers outside the United States would be measurably greater if it had included more than mere references to the structural approach which is America's distinctive contribution to the teaching of foreign languages. Although the reader will find brief descriptions of language teaching programs in which the structural approach is used, he will not find any detailed statement of the basic theory or of the applications of structural linguistics.

HAROLD B. ALLEN,
University of Minnesota

PHILOSOPHY AND ANALYSIS. Edited by Margaret Macdonald. New York: Philosophical Library, 1954, pp. xiii-[illegible]. $[illegible]

This book would have been more accurately titled, Philosophy and *Analysis*, for it is mainly a reprinting of selected articles from *Analysis*—a British scholarly journal dedicated to the proposition that philosophy *is* analysis. Stated in its positive form, the general point of view is that "the result of philosophy is not a number of 'philosophical propositions' but to make propositions clear" (Wittgenstein, p. ii). By negative implication, therefore, the core of traditional philosophizing has been, at best, misplaced poetry (C. A. Mace, p. 22); at worst, "metaphysical verbiage" embodying the "logical mistakes" of would-be philosophers caught in "linguistic traps" (A. J. Ayer, pp. 23, 5); or, in a nutshell indeed, just "a series of dotty answers to screwy questions" (S. Toumlin, p. 132).

The history and editorial policy of *Analysis* are ably summarized by Margaret Macdonald in a brief introductory chapter. Launched in November 1933 under the sponsorship of a small group of British philosophers who had been influenced by Russell, Moore, and Wittgenstein, it has since been published continuously except for World War II years of newsprint shortage. From the beginning the intent was to print material which is "elucidatory rather than speculative," and confined to the clarification of precisely defined problems of limited scope. Papers were even welcomed which presented only a tentative stage of a writer's thinking, so that discussion by other contributors might help to produce required solutions.

It follows that the articles in any given number of this parent publication have tended to be brief, deliberately incomplete, and extensively cross-referenced with articles in previous issues. So long as files of back numbers were available, the obvious advantages of the editorial policy tended to compensate for its equally obvious disadvantages. But with many numbers of *Analysis* now out of print, the present volume of selected reprints will be a much needed acquisition for many reference libraries and serious students of the language-clarification trend in philosophy. Its value is enhanced, moreover, by a reorganization of the original articles, not merely in chronological order, but also topically under such chapter headings as: *Poetry, Metaphysics, and Language; Some Problems of Meaning; Knowledge, Belief and Assertion; Saying and Asserting;* etc. Thus, contributions which were originally episodic are now better unified.

This book, however, is still not for the beginner. Readers previously unfamiliar with its themes would do well first to consult more

self-complete works such as A. J. Ayer's classic *Language, Truth and Logic*, or J. Hosper's *Introduction to Philosophical Analysis* (reviewed with general comment on the entire movement in QJS, XL, 82-3).

Finally, although the clarification of language concerns students of rhetoric as much as it does philosopher-logicians, the speech specialist who reads *Philosophy and Analysis* cannot but be struck again with how little direct bearing most such literature yet has upon his own work. Hence a modest suggestion. . . .

For the past several years *Analysis* has sponsored a series of competitions in which readers are invited to "solve in 600 words a small, definite philosophical problem devised by a setter who also judges the entries." Thus far five such "problems" have been set and the three best entries for each published. But although results of the competitions are reported in the introduction of the present volume to have been "interesting" (p. 4), we note that none rate reprinting in its later chapters.

Is it possible that the "questions" have lacked sufficient challenge to worthy contenders? Surely a low mark of something or other was reached by *number four* which queried: "If a distraction makes me forget my headache, does it make my head stop aching or does it only stop me feeling it aching?" Even if the word limit of the competition had to be raised, could not the more fruitful question be asked: "What useful application has the logical clarification of language, as illustrated in *Analysis*, to the rhetorically clear use of language?"

Pose a problem like that, Madame Editor, and we shall await the results with more than philosophical concern!

WILLIAM R. GONDIN,
College of the City of New York

AN INTRODUCTION TO DESCRIPTIVE LINGUISTICS. By H. A. Gleason, Jr. New York: Henry Holt, 1955; pp. ix+389. $5.50.

WORKBOOK IN DESCRIPTIVE LINGUISTICS. By H. A. Gleason, Jr. New York: Henry Holt, 1955; pp. 88. $2.25.

After a rather vague opening chapter on "expression" and "content" in language, the author gets down to some brass tacks of linguistic science. Since this is a text for English-speaking students, he leads off with an analysis of English consonants, vowels, stress and intonation. In his treatment of the English vowel system, he follows Trager and Smith's *Outline of English Structure*, and, though there are those who may object, this reviewer feels that it is the best all-round approach at the present time. At least, the student learns a systematic method for analyzing the sound system of English, granted the Trager-Smith analysis and the theory underlying it may be revised in the light of later work.

The next section of the text, chapters Five—Eleven, deals with morphology and syntax. On the basis of just reading, not teaching, this text, it seemed the best organized part of the book. Chapter Eight, on English morphology, presents the essentials of the subject with clearness and precision.

Chapters Twelve—Eighteen, the following section, deal with the basic concept of the phoneme, phonemic analysis, and their application to English and to language learning. The author recognizes the importance of relativity in defining the phoneme; however, he goes so far in this that the concept of the phoneme, and the criteria used to determine the phonemes of a language, are not brought out clearly enough for beginners. Chapter Sixteen presents a highly controversial but judicious discussion of the differences in phonemic analysis and resulting transcription used by Bloch and Trager, Bloomfield, Fries, Jones, Kenyon, Nida, Pike, Trager and Smith, Thomas, and Ward. Its tracing of the evolution of the Trager-Smith system will increase the understanding, if not the agreement, concerning their analysis.

This reviewer's chief negative criticism is not of the content of this work but of its organization. To choose to present morphology before phonology, and end up with the section on phonemic analysis a hundred pages or so removed from the discussion of the English sound system, is a serious error in the opinion of this reviewer. Also, though the workbook follows the text chapter by chapter, this rather mechanical integration of theory and practice does not achieve sufficient unity—the interrelating of material in the text and workbook would have helped. The author deserves credit for providing a laboratory manual, however, so that students can learn the fundamentals of linguistic analysis by working a series of graded problems. Unfortunately, the first exercise is one of the most difficult in the workbook, even though it reveals interesting differences between the structure of Hebrew and English. A set of answers for the

teacher would have helped remove any misunderstandings of the problems.

The final chapters on marginal topics such as "The Process of Communication," and Language Classification," are valuable in their own right but would have been better replaced by more discussion of the fundamentals of linguistics. Chapter Twenty, on "Variation in Speech," however, is useful for its treatment of language, dialect, and mapping of dialect areas.

Both books are printed in a clear, readable format, and the illustrations are cleancut and easy to understand. A table of symbols is provided at the beginning of the workbook, and should probably have been inserted at the beginning of the text instead of in the middle. Only three typographical errors were noted in the text: *it* for *is* on page 8; a reduplication of *the* on page 330; and the use of barred ɨ for *i* in an example of the pronunciation of the word *children* in isolation on page 232, although this last may be a misunderstanding on the part of this reviewer.

ROBERT W. ALBRIGHT,
North Dakota Agricultural College

LANGUAGE, MEANING AND MATURITY. Edited by S. I. Hayakawa. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954; pp. xii+364. $4.00.

It takes courage to be an anthologist. No matter how carefully selections are made, inevitably, many individuals, groups, factions will be displeased. In making these selections from *ETC: A Review of General Semantics*, 1943-1953, Dr. Hayakawa had to face not only this "normal" anthological hazard, but also the "extra-normal" one posed by an inter-disciplinary subject. As Hayakawa states in his foreword:

> Because *ETC* has welcomed the co-operation of all students of the relations between language and behavior, this collection is not limited to the writings of those who call themselves general semanticists or acknowledge specific indebtedness to Korzybski's influence. The examination of language, of reactions to language, and of the assumptions underlying language has been going on steadily in the twentieth century on many fronts, and ETC. has always included, and will continue to include, important semantic observations from whatever source. This policy will also explain the fact that some articles in *ETC.*, including a few included in this volume, were originally published elsewhere. It has been part of *ETC.'s* policy since the beginning to reprint, especially from publications addressed to specialized audiences, articles which, in the opinion of the editors, deserve a wider audience.

On the whole, it appears to this reviewer that he has successfully overcome the aforementioned hurdles.

The selections are grouped into six categories. The first, "Introduction," contains two articles, one by Anatol Rapoport, "What Is Semantics?" and the other by Hayakawa, "Semantics, General Semantics, and Related Disciplines." Rapoport points out both the strengths and weaknesses in Korzybskian methodology. This astute analysis by a man with a strong biological and mathematical background may serve to offset some of the cultish aspects of general semantics.

In his article, Hayakawa relates general semantics to semantics, significs, operationalism, literary criticism (I. A. Richards), linguistics, non-directive counseling, group dynamics, mathematical physics, and cybernetics. This is accomplished in twenty pages and suffers the consequences of extreme condensation.

The second section, "Problems of Communication," should be of special interest to those concerned with public address, discussion, and public speaking. It contains the late Professor I. J. Lee's article, "Why Discussions Go Astray," a study of the "three types of reaction which lead to misunderstanding." Based on a study of fifty discussion groups, it pinpoints some of the factors which led to distintegration of the discussion.

In "Communication: Its Blocking and Its Facilitation," the second paper in Section II, Carl Rogers discusses the emotional factors which block communication and some things that can be done to diminish their effect. The third item in his section is by F. R. Roethlisberger, entitled "Barriers to Communication Between Men," and also stresses the affective blocks in communication. While these three articles are quite brief, they represent some rather new approaches to the difficult and complex process of interpersonal communication and hint at exciting areas worthy of investigation and research. If the reader is tired of the "same old" books on public speaking and discussion, he might try following the trails to which these point.

Section III, "Problems of Education," presents rather uniquely contrasting approaches to

the difficulties inherent in changing fixed patterns of behavior. The first is by Alfred Korzybski, entitled "A Veteran's Readjustment and Extensional Methods." Anatol Rapoport reports on the "animism" and "magic" implicit in the thinking of a group of aviation cadets when working on problems in Newtonian physics. Similar "gremlins" crop up when Wendell Johnson examines the attitudes of some English teachers in his paper, "You Can't Write Writing." In the final article in this section, John R. Kirk, in his "Communication Theory and Methods of Fixing Belief," discusses the relationship between "noise" and spurious information in the communication and messages both by machine and interpersonally.

Space does not permit discussion of all the other papers, interesting though they may be. There are articles by Felix Cohen, Benjamin Lee Whorf, Charles Morris, Gregory Bateson and others, and range from discussion of lend-lease policy to the esoteric "Comments on Mysticism and Its Language."

The reader unfamiliar with general semantics will not get from this book the answer to the question, "What is general semantics?" To do that he would have to study the texts in the field or take some courses in it. Only then would he understand the futility of seeking an answer to the question. If he is sharp, he will get a hint from seeing what Anatol Rapoport does in his article, "What Is Semantics?" Instead of answering the question, he reformulates it to read, "What Do Semanticists Do?" This book indicates some of the areas of learning which interest the general semanticist. The wide variety makes for interesting reading. One could look upon it as a brief outline for a liberal education.

HARRY L. WEINBERG,
Temple University

NOAH WEBSTER'S PRONUNCIATION AND MODERN NEW ENGLAND SPEECH: A Comparison. By Karl-Erik Lindlad. (American Institute, Upsala University, Sweden: Essays and Studies on American Language and Literature: XI). Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1954, pp. 90. $2.00, paper.

Since Noah Webster, "who, at the end of the 18th and at the beginning of the 19th century, set out to teach his fellow-countrymen what he considered to be good and 'proper' English," was himself a New Englander, "the publication of the Linguistic Atlas of New England, in 1939, afforded a wealth of new material to Webster students." Was Webster's pronunciation, asks the author of this study, "the precursor of General American or of typically New England speech; or was it simply an aping of British pronunciation as reflected in the recommendations of British orthoepists of the time?" Granting that there is such a thing as "typically New England speech," the questions are intriguing.

Readers of this study who are interested in the answers, however, will be disappointed. For, as the author himself admits, an answer to these questions "must be based on a complete phonology." But this analysis is restricted to an investigation of "sounds derived from Middle English stressed simple vowels (except in cases where the development of a diphthong fell together with that of a simple vowel)." Within that prescribed limitation, "the investigation mainly comprises two analyses, one of Webster's sounds and one of modern New England pronunciation as represented in the Atlas, both types viewed in a historical perspective." And "as far as the analysis of Webster's sounds goes, this investigation should be regarded as a complement of" Joshua Neumann's dissertation (1924), which is considered to be "the principal work, apart from that of Krapp, on Webster's pronunciation."

It is the author's candid hope, nevertheless, "that the analysis has some value as it is." It has; but it also has a number of shortcomings. First, the numbering of the vowels according to Webster's scheme is presented in the text in exactly the same fashion as the numbering of footnotes, which makes for an unnecessary confusion. The *theta* symbol is erroneously used for "a rounded, slightly centralized vowel, a little higher than [ʌ]," so that [hθm] appears for [həm] in transcription of a pronunciation, recorded in the Atlas, for "home."

Second, when a bibliography lists two different Joneses as the authors of two different dictionaries almost two hundred years apart, a more consistent and specific distinction should be made between them than simply "Daniel Jones" to refer to one and "Jones" alone to refer to the other. For example, "Daniel Jones" is mentioned in one instance in conjunction with Webster, while two paragraphs further on the "Jones" mentioned in conjunction with Walker happens to be the other one, but the references are given simply as indicated here.

Finally, it is a serious shortcoming in a study of this kind to equate the work of the 18th- and 19th-century orthoepists with that of 20th-

century linguistic scientists *without* a thorough analysis and evaluation of the earlier writers' separate works. Sheridan and Walker, for instance, are cited simply "on account of their authority," together with a number of other lesser-known British and American orthoëpists, "as a background to Webster's writings," despite the author's own admission that descriptions of sounds in the "older literature" of orthoëpy "easily became stereotyped cliches, used in one book after the other, so that it is difficult to tell what expresses the author's own views and what has just been taken over, rather uncritically, from others."

Taking its limitations and shortcomings into due consideration, however, what remains nevertheless fulfills and maintains the author's hope "that the analysis has some value as it is," and, if for that reason alone, the study deserves to be read.

JOHN B. NEWMAN,
Queens College

PRINCIPLES OF THEATRE ART. By H. D. Albright, William P. Halstead, and Lee Mitchell. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1955: pp. xii+547. $6.00.

When three nationally-known and esteemed professors from three separate departments in three distinguished universities conscientiously collaborate in preparing and co-ordinating the teaching matter in the field of theatre, the resultant text should be excellent and valuable. Those two adjectives will serve well to characterize *Principles of Theatre Art*, which has the additional virtues of being beautifully printed and sumptuously illustrated. The book is divided into five major sections and a series of Appendices, as follows: Section I—Drama; Section II—Acting; Section III—Theatre and Stage; Section IV—Design; Section V—Directing. Each of these sections is subdivided into chapters, making a total of twenty-seven. The four "Appendices" include: "Projects and Exercises for the Student; On the Art of Costuming; A Note on Make-up; and Selected Bibliographies." The book concludes with an "Index to the Plays Mentioned in the Text" and an "Index to Subject Matter." In addition to the thirty plates of beautifully selected and printed photographic illustrations, there are more than fifty pages of splendidly executed illustrations (drawn by Lee Mitchell) which serve admirably to illuminate the text. The whole book is written in a clear and pleasant style, which makes the reading of it a pleasure and adds to its usefulness.

In so far as the book has faults, they arise largely from the necessity for compression and from a too-ambitious aim in planning. In the Preface it is stated that the book was planned as a text for courses in "Dramatic Production, The Elements of Theatre, An Introduction to Drama and the Theatre, or another of the many variants appearing in college and University announcements." In the attempt to meet the needs of all kinds of general courses, the authors have had to sacrifice specificity and detailed coverage, thus lending a superficiality to certain of the sections and chapters. The best section in this respect is the section on Design. In this section there is a methodical approach carried through with some thoroughness of detail. Perhaps the worst section in the book is that on Drama. In addition to a lack of adequate treatment for want of space, there is a serious confusion of the play as a finished work of art in itself with its own independent structure and principles, and the play as a performance on the stage with yet other structural principles. A play is not merely an "orchestra score" or a "short-hand script" for a director and actors, it is an independent literary creation which requires to be analyzed and understood before it can be interpreted by either a critic or a director. Compression, in forcing the authors to resort all too frequently to cataloguing instead of explanation, has led them into not a few errors of statement. A few examples must suffice to illustrate such errors. In the brief treatment of the "Four Characteristics of Drama" the first three named characteristics—*temporal, mimetic, interpretative*—are characteristics of other time arts, such as music, the epic, the novel; and the fourth named characteristic—*synthesized*—does not, as defined, belong to the play as a play, but rather to the play interpreted upon the stage. Moreover, in borrowing from the later rhetorical use of the term *mimetic*, rather than from its use in the *Poetics*, the authors have misinterpreted the word. Yet another illustration of misinterpretation is to be found in the treatment of unity. No play with which I am familiar on "Abraham Lincoln, Joan of Arc, Peer Gynt, or the Count of Monte Cristo" is unified merely by being about one of these personages. It is possible to talk about the unity of a play in various ways, but when we discuss the unity of a play as a play—not as a production or an effect upon an audience—we are dealing with the unity of its plot—the unity of change represented in the total structure. A play-

wright may unify that change in three major ways: through the unity of a completed change in action; through the unity of a completed change in character; and through the unity of a completed change in thought. Neither of these necessarily means the "restriction of drama to a single occurrence" if by "single occurrence" is meant a single episode. Neither restriction to singleness of locale nor compression of time will serve, as the authors state, to produce unity. Both *Grand Hotel* and *Street Scene*, two plays cited to reveal unification through restriction to a single locale are unified through thought—the unity of change in idea. Nor are the *Alchemist*, *Phaedra*, or *Candida* so unified by locale. The first two are unified in terms of action and so is the last, with the added unity of change in thought. This idea of unity through locale leads the authors to make another parenthetical misstatement about Greek tragedy. They say: "None of these has been cited here because, of all that survives to us, only one, the *Oresteia* of Aeschylus, is a complete work. Each of the others is but one part of a three-part whole." Of the three Greek tragedians whose works are extant only Aeschylus composed regularly trilogies such as the authors have in mind. Sophocles and Euripides, while they always competed with three plays and occasionally may have composed these three as a trilogy in the manner of the *Oresteia*, usually presented three separate plays, sometimes but not always loosely connected in subject matter or in idea. The whole section on Drama would have been more accurate and useful if it had been written from the standpoint of drama as drama, with a concluding chapter or division on drama as translated on the stage.

Similar difficulties arising from the necessity for compression might be cited in other sections but they appear, perhaps, most glaringly in the section on Directing. Here the old difficulty of unity raises its head. There are similar difficulties of definition in the division on "Progression" and on "Rhythm." These difficulties arise largely in the discussion of the director's relation to the script, the analysis of the play. The treatments of the actual processes of directing—casting, rehearsals, etc. —are well done. The illustrative drawings here, as throughout the book, are to be commended in high terms. The difficulties cited in this review are similar to those which any author or group of authors will meet in attempting to prepare a multiple-purpose text for general courses. If they have occupied a disproportionate space in this review, they must not be allowed to overshadow the distinctive merits of this excellent book. It deserves and will receive, I am sure, wide adoption and use in colleges and universities. The three authors are to be highly commended for their excellent work.

HUBERT HEFFNER,
Indiana University

TRAGICOMEDY. By Marvin T. Herrick. Urbana, Illinois: The University of Illinois Press, 1955; pp. 331. $5.00 cloth; $4.00 paper.

Plautus started it all. In his *Amphitryon* he coined the term *tragicocomoedia* that challenged and baffled scholars to define and elucidate. Classical authority appeared to preserve a sharp distinction between comedy and tragedy; yet here was a play that was neither, or both. It incorporated dignified *and* ridiculous action, noble *and* humble characters.

Through the years, but particularly from the Renaissance to the eighteenth century, scholars have been made uncomfortable, if not indignant, by both the term and the dramatic form; but not so the public. Whether called by Plautus' designation "tragicomedy" or Cinthio's "mixed tragedy" (*tragedia mista*) and "tragedy with a happy ending" (*tragedia di fin lieto*); whether called by the French nineteenth-century invention *drame* or by the American "comedy-drama," this type of entertainment has always been popular. The audience enjoys and demands laughter with its tears. Under whatever label, tragicomedy "has always been the backbone of the modern drama, which has always been a compromise between classical tragedy and classical comedy . . . most of the significant modern dramas still occupy a middle ground between tragedy and comedy."

Mr. Herrick's study, surely, is a definitive one. Drawing largely upon Aristotle, Horace, and Seneca among the ancients, upon Cinthio, Guarini, Macropedius, and the Christian Terence among Renaissance authors, as well as upon Shakespeare, Fletcher, and Massinger, the author has written a lucid and valuable book. One of its principal contributions to scholarship is its geographical coverage. Lancaster on the French and Ristine on the English tragicomedy are here brought together in one investigation, in addition to the mass of Italian theory and research. Spain is excluded because its drama "exerted little or no influence upon the development of tragicomedy in either France or England."

Beginning with "The Classical Background of

Tragicomedy," in which not only the *Amphitryon* but also certain of Euripides' plays are described as tragicomedies, Herrick chronologically analyzes and discusses various contributions to the term and the dramatic form, from the contribution of the Christian Terence through the time of Davenant.

Although all the chapters are of uniform excellence, mention should perhaps be made of the Third, on Giraldi Cinthio, because of his influence upon the Elizabethans, and the Fifth, "Pastoral Tragicomedy," since the pastoral so strongly aided, in both theory and practice, the growth of tragicomedy. The admirable concluding chapter contains a succinct summary of the material plus a brief mention of the French *drame*.

Prodigious research has here produced not only a work of genuine scholarship but an interestingly readable volume as well.

ALBERT E. JOHNSON,
Texas College of Arts and Industries

AMERICA TAKES THE STAGE ROMANTICISM IN AMERICAN DRAMA AND THEATRE, 1750-1900. By Richard Moody. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1955; pp. viii+322. $5.00.

It is widely held that the literature of the American theatre before the first world war is crude, graceless, a barren waste for critical adventurers. Yet scholars may find profit where critics disdain to tread: library shelves groan under the riches salvaged from the works of medieval amateurs by Karl Young, and Elizabethan professionals by the Malone Society; they treasure the surveys of *mélodrame* by Ginisty and the *commedia* by DuChartre and Lea. Reich on the mime and LeGrand on Plautus, Payne on Chaplin, George Speaight on the toy theatre—all these are small monuments to that half-world between art and pastime which is perhaps the best measure of man that the unscientific mind has ever devised. For the popular theatre is an accurate mirror of the humanness of humanity, its aspirations and frustrations, its codes and clichés, its myths and dreams and mortality. It is therefore a subject that the scholar, unlike his critical cousin, cannot afford to ignore.

Mr. Moody, wading vigorously into the wasteland of American dramatic literature, does so without apology or apprehension. True, he does expend a few pages discussing the general romantic characteristics of literature and the other arts in the period as prelude to his thesis that the drama is also essentially romantic, but this has the unfortunate effect of reminding us that romanticism in literature inspired the works of Hawthorne and Emerson and Thoreau and Melville and even Poe and Charles Brockden Brown, while producing in the theatre *The Forest Rose, Metamora,* and *Davy Crockett.* The romantic spirit of the young nation is sufficiently apparent in its domestic actions, its political foibles, its oratory and journalism without straining the reader's tolerance or objectivity by reminding him of *Moby Dick* and *The Last of the Mohicans.*

Once this, as it were, customs barrier is passed, the panorama that stretches before the pioneer is vast and relatively unmapped. Moody's selected play list contains about six hundred titles, including (surprisingly) a number by English authors. Few of these have been examined by scholars and fewer by critics, and the problem of classification or arrangement is a fascinating one. Here the classification is by subject matter ("Indian," "Frontier," "Conventional Romantic"), a sensible way of focussing the reader's attention away from the temptation to evaluate. Negro minstrelsy is the first of the "native" forms to develop, reflecting the sentimentality of the audience and its delight in an entertainment which followed no classical pattern in structure, and giving birth to the mythical figure of the stage Negro. Almost concurrent, however, was the development of other mythical heroes, the stage Indian, the stage Yankee, the stage Frontiersman, stereotypes growing out of the skills of particular actors, as in the *commedia,* and acceptable as symbols to a mass audience of romantics in search of heroic images. For whatever the distinctive mask and costume these heroes might wear they were all basically the same hero, a reflection of "the ever-increasing faith . . . in the rights and abilities of the common man." This was the philosophical essence of popular romanticism in early nineteenth-century America and on this its myths and mythical heroes were created. Leave the reality out of question.

Mr. Moody also considers at some length the stage practice of the theatre in his chosen period, finding that here "the manifestations of romanticism . . . were on the whole more striking than those in the drama." The playwrights' scripts called for representations of remote, exotic locales, or sublime and awe-inspiring renderings of the American scene. The spectacular and the startling, too, played a large role in the popularity of the physical theater. Not a few of these sensation scenes must have strained the capacity of the scene-

docks and the stage machinists of theatres that had yet to discover the creative powers of electricity or the camera. For instance:

> The bomb bursts and the explosion is terrible. The hut, already undermined by workers, falls down with a terrible noise. It is entirely destroyed; but the fragments fall in the direction of the bomb, near the bottom of the stage, leaving the actors untouched who are on the scene. The falling in of the hut shows to the spectators the whole extent of the port of Algiers. Beyond the sea, the western pier and one of the vessels on the roadstead are seen in flames.

This, of course, is only a stage *direction;* it is what the author saw in his mind's eye. What the stage produced and the audience saw with its own eyes can only be guessed at. But that the playwright should demand, the producer attempt, and the spectator accept an illusion that must have involved an eager surrender of disbelief is perhaps the clearest evidence of the romantic spirit in the American theatre.

America Takes the Stage is an accurate and comprehensive introduction to a subject which scholars are only beginning to exploit. It should stimulate others to study in greater detail the areas here defined, to examine more closely the relation between (for example) the stage Yankee and the New Englander of literature and life, the effect of political movements like nativism on the theatre, the sifting down of the attitudes of intellectual leaders to the popular level. There are still many "lost plays" to be rediscovered and the possibilities for stage history and theatrical biography have hardly been scratched (see W.G.B. Carson in the *Educational Theatre Journal,* October, 1955). Anyone with an interest in the theatre or in American life will find *America Takes the Stage* an inviting book to read, but for scholars it ought also to be an invitation and a challenge to join in the exploration.

ALAN S. DOWNER,
Princeton University

WILLIAM POEL AND THE ELIZABETHAN REVIVAL. By Robert Speaight. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954; pp. 302. $4.75.

William Poel died in 1934, leaving this epitaph: "As a house can only be built by laying one brick upon another, so intimately dependent are all our lives upon the labours of those who have gone before. . . ." Robert Speaight has with great patience set about restoring the edifice of Poel's nearly sixty years' striving to advance the British—and American—stage.

In the Author's Preface, Speaight admits to having been asked, frequently, during the writing of his book, "Who was William Poel?" and American readers are apt to prove even less familiar with this figure than his biographer's British countrymen. Yet Poel, as pioneer textual editor and stage director, ranks pre-eminent in the development of an artistic, noncommercial English theatre and drama, in the late nineteenth century and early twentieth.

Today, theatre audiences and readers of dramatic literature tend alike to take for granted undoctored publication and performance of plays by Shakespeare, Jonson, and Marlowe. And Shakespeare's "problem plays" interest the modern student, especially. It may be with some surprise, then, that one meets this testimonial, in Poel's own words:

> I remember my literary instructor—I . . . was 17 or 18 years of age—telling me that there were two pieces written by Shakespeare which he hoped I should never read because they were not proper ones. One was *Measure for Measure* and the other was *Troilus and Cressida*. . . . *Measure for Measure* was the first work that I did for the stage society. . . . *Troilus and Cressida* is going to be the last one that I shall present to a London public on my own responsibility.

Poel arose at a banquet in his honor, in 1912, to speak these words, just after Bernard Shaw had publicly attested to Poel's having produced *Romeo and Juliet* so that "for the first time it became endurable. I sat at it with Mr. Granville-Barker. I forget who else was in the house. I think there were about six people."

Poel's experiments in stage direction are shown to have influenced to some extent Shaw's own writing for the theatre; and the author suggests that Poel's revival of the platform stage opened the way for a renaissance of poetic drama, ". . . in a manner reborn with Eliot's *Murder in the Cathedral.*" Speaight, a sometime actor for the Old Vic, was for a number of years associated with Poel personally; and he enacted Becket in Eliot's drama both in England and in the United States. Such tributes as the foregoing are thus not to be taken as in any sense casual.

Occasionally, though, the author seems unduly patronizing, as when he takes Poel's side on an ill-fated stage-version of *Samson Agonistes,* against the evidently just criticism of (Sir)

Max Beerbohm. Now and again, Speaight the biographer locks horns with Speaight the scholar; thus, his personal hypothesis concerning dating and derivation of *Der Bestrafte Brüdermord* (pp. 240, 241) seems tenuous and intrusive. Many pages of illustration, showing scenes from Poel's varied repertoire, at times suggest that this director's stage-craft was not so very far from that of his antagonist contemporaries, Irving and Beerbohm-Tree; but Speaight is himself ready enough to allow Poel's limitations, along with his achievements.

This generally fair-minded balance places Speaight's study far above mere eulogistic biography. It is a chronicle worth reading, of vital changes affecting Anglo-American theatre and drama during the past century.

PAT M. RYAN, JR.,
Colorado School of Mines

SPEECH: CODE, MEANING, AND COMMUNICATION. By John W. Black and Wilbur E. Moore. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1955; pp. viii+430. $4.50.

This book demands effort on the part of its student: it may be worth that effort. It is more "theoretical" than "practical," its focus less on precept than on concept, less on *how* to communicate ideas than on the orienting knowledge which enables a student to comprehend the *why* of the *how*. It is more appropriate for the student majoring in speech than for one electing a single terminal course, for a fundamentals course in general speech than for rigorous training in voice, interpretation, public speaking, or discussion.

The subtitle of the book abstracts its content. Its "code" is the audible code, the visible code being classified under a later category. Three early chapters are devoted to speech science: the anatomy of hearing and speech, the physics of sound, and phonetics. Many topics are admirably treated: for example, the contribution of pause to the communication of meaning, sense and aesthetic components of speech, the phenomenon of redundancy, and a negative-practice method of eliminating the vocalized pause. How technical such analysis should be is moot; the authors may err on the side of excessive detail. For example, although commendably the loudness-intensity distinction is avoided, it may be questioned whether a beginning student needs to know that "silence, or zero decibels, is . . . a power output of 10^{-16} watt or a pressure level of 0.0002 dyne per square centimeter." And prefacing this definition with a "hope that even the most squeamish nonmathematical student will not flinch at the next few sentences" probably will not forestall the flinch.

The "meaning" section offers a more fruitful treatment of vocabulary than most textbooks afford, a condensed but enlightening exposition of semantic concepts of evaluation and abstraction, and a method of testing the validity of propositions through both logical and semantic analysis. Apt illustrations often enhance the value of this section.

The "communication" section comprises nine of the sixteen chapters: on organization, motivation, style, bodily action, referential and evocative interpretation, interpretative reading, public address, group discussion, and microphone speaking. Noteworthy are the imparting, often neglected, of the specific nature of the contribution rendered by organization to meaning; a novel, instructive discussion of style; a presentation of gesture as "an active representation of a concept"; a concise summary of research in group dynamics. Sometimes the treatment becomes unnecessarily technical. For example, should four full pages be devoted to sound-powered, crystal, moving-coil, velocity, carbon, and condenser microphones, including such terms as capacitance and voltage?

One of the best chapters is the opening one, which relates speech to behavior, culture, thought, and personality. Some chapters end with a brief "summary and application," in every instance useful. But since application constitutes the core of a course, many instructors would vote for development of these appendages; elaboration in class will usurp time better devoted to actual experiences in communication. Instructors will welcome at the end of every chapter, however, the comprehensive set of "projects for practice," many highly original, very few routine, all sedulously designed to clarify and implement the concepts in the chapter. It is obvious that the authors have distilled much teaching experience and laboratory experimentation.

The author's style can scarcely be characterized as low in specific gravity. Admittedly, a textbook's level of readability should challenge a student's grasp to approach his reach. Difficult concepts should not be evaded. Expression of them should not condescend: neither should it baffle. Analysis by the staff of the Reading Laboratory at my own university reports that approximately the first third of this book can be read fairly easily by most college freshmen;

the second third is much too difficult for any but superior freshmen; and the late chapters can be read comfortably only by those few freshmen who have an extensive reading vocabulary and a high level of critical-thinking ability. If the book is restricted to sophomores or to speech majors solely, the first half probably can be easily understood; but the second half will present even to them problems in vocabulary, sentence structure, and complexity of concept. Perhaps the authors should have more consciously observed the rhetorical principle of writing in ways and terms adjusted to the particular audience for which a communication is intended. The written word, in textbooks at any rate, might well borrow from the spoken word the criterion of instant intelligibility.

J. CALVIN CALLAGHAN,
Syracuse University

GUIDE TO GOOD SPEECH. By James H. McBurney and Ernest J. Wrage. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1955; pp. vi+346. $3.75.

The *Guide to Good Speech* is not just a brief edition of *The Art of Good Speech*, although its philosophic parentage is clear. This shorter volume must be examined as a new textbook in its own right, containing important improvements over the longer book and losing very little by abbreviation (from 584 tightly printed to 346 generous pages).

Both these books clearly develop the authors' philosophy of speech: The art of speech is not a self-contained system of easily learned gimmicks by which to manipulate people; rather, it is at once an effective and defensible approach to a liberal education, and a practical tool vital to the operation of a democratic society. Both books, written to realize these objectives, will appeal to the teacher. But the new book, more attractive, concise and readable, also gives these objectives a lot of student appeal.

The twenty-one chapters can be grouped into five areas: four important "point-of-view" chapters; four chapters on speech preparation; four on delivery; six on modes of support and methods of inquiry, reporting, advocacy, and evocation; and three optional chapters on occasional speeches, oral reading, and radio-TV speaking. For the teacher of those unmanageable one and two hour courses, or for the adult short course, the first 170 pages, standing alone, provide an adequate if minimal body of theory. But the main use of the book will be in the standard one-semester terminal course in "fundamentals." The first twelve chapters present basic matters briefly and clearly, and allow the student to begin making well-rounded speeches early in the course. The remaining nine chapters of "advanced" and optional material can then follow as the teacher's time and inclination dictate, allowing flexibility without losing unity in the course. The allocation of space and sequence of topics in this text are much preferable to that of the older book.

The four-part classification of speech purposes or types may still seem unfamiliar and slightly overlapping to many teachers. It does represent, however, a sound and teachable approach, integrating and including much important material too often ignored or regarded as extraneous. The treatment of reasoning and evidence is both brief and complete; but no way of getting students to use it in this form has yet been suggested by any textbook. The section on "inquiry," however, has been much improved. Many of the truly excellent and usable chapter-end materials in the larger book have been dropped.

The critics of the older book said that its style sometimes became "anxious, indoctrinating" or lapsed into "wordy obscurity." Some also argued that the book was too difficult and "high-flown" for freshmen. The latter criticism is preposterous, an insult to students, teachers, and fundamentals courses. But the objections to style were often justified, and the authors have striven nobly to improve the style of the new book—successfully, in my opinion. On the whole, the rewriting and reorganization have produced a new and different text, attractive and tightly written, and based on a philosophy you can discuss proudly with anyone. It will take its place on that very small shelf of really good fundamentals texts.

ALBERT J. CROFT,
University of Oklahoma

HANDBOOK OF PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE. By Henry A. Davidson. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1955; pp. xviii+292. $3.75.

Henry A. Davidson is an M.D., a practicing psychiatrist, parliamentarian to the 8,000-member American Psychiatric Association, and parliamentarian to the Donaldson Run (Arlington, Virginia) Civic Association. It is good to have a book from a man who is putting the important principles of parliamentary procedure into useful practice both in his professional association and in his community.

It is pleasant to be able to say that Dr.

Davidson's book makes a number of worthwhile contributions. His style is simple, direct, and at times even interesting, this last something of a rarity in parliamentary manuals. He includes a chapter on "How Not to Get Pushed Around," and thus is one of the few writers on the subject to take note of the important role of strategy in parliamentary meetings. His chapters on budgets, forms, and documents will please many a harassed officer of an organization.

It must be admitted, however, that the author has one tendency that is unfortunate: he is inclined to take quite a number of liberties with common parliamentary law, with generally accepted procedural principles.

It is quite true that parliamentary procedure is not sacrosanct and is not static. It is also true that an organization adopts its own rules and that usually some of these rules will be special. But when Dr. Davidson writes in his preface, "What one parliamentary authority adopted last year can be changed by another next year," this is carrying flexibility a bit far. The statement itself is factually true. But an organization that actually changes its more important rules yearly will soon be in serious trouble.

This extremely flexible approach to the parliamentary code leads to some doubtful and confusing rulings. Some of these deal with minor matters. The author says that he has "abandoned 'previous question.'" He has not—he has simply renamed it "close debate," as is sensible and is now quite common. He has reversed common parliamentary law on "session" and "meeting," making the former period of duration the shorter and the latter the longer. This is not a big point—but why borrow trouble?

More serious are some other departures. On the amendability of a committee report, the author says, "Once a committee report has been read, it cannot thereafter be changed." Again, the denotation is correct but the connotation is misleading. Common parliamentary law says that once a committee report of policy has been stated by the chairman of the assembly it is the *property of the assembly* and may be amended by that body at will. The committee, as such, is no longer responsible for the report, of course. But this is understood. Robert rules with unmistakable clarity on the point in his *Parliamentary Law*, p. 288: "The committee's report is thus treated just as any proposition submitted by a member, the assembly modifying it as it pleases before adopting it. This does not change the committee's report, and if the report is entered in the minutes or published, the record must show clearly what the committee reported."

On the relationship of main motions to substitute motions, we read that "Generally that is what a minority view does: it would substitute the negative of the proposition for the affirmative." On this ground, the author condemns the substitute motion, and rightly. But common parliamentary law says that the substitute motion, whether from a committee or the floor, offers *an alternative solution* to the same general problem covered in the main motion (or majority report). This makes the substitute motion a highly useful tool.

On the role of the chairman, these statements appear: "In large or auditorium-type meetings, the chair does not discuss the merits of a motion. . . . In small round-table meetings, the chair *may* participate in discussion if no one objects." The first statement correctly defines the impartiality of the assembly presiding officer. If by "small round-table meetings" is meant committee meetings, the second dictum understates the role of the committee chairman as generally accepted. Robert defines the participation of the committee chairman in his *Rules of Order Revised*, p. 213, thus: "Instead of the chairman's abstaining from speaking and voting, he is usually the most active participant in the discussions and work of the committee."

It remains true that Dr. Davidson has made a contribution to the field of parliamentary procedure and one that will be found useful by many groups.

JOSEPH F. O'BRIEN,
The Pennsylvania State University

TELEVISION PROGRAM PRODUCTION. By Carroll O'Meara. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1955; pp. vii+361. $5.00.

Carroll O'Meara states that the objective of this book is "to give full and authoritative treatment to the many elements which contribute to efficient production of good television programs." Considering the scope of his subject and the large number of topics he must necessarily include to achieve this objective, O'Meara does a very commendable job. He succeeds in giving us, in a little more than 300 pages, a good over-all look at the many aspects of television program production.

O'Meara brings to this project twenty years of television, radio, and agency experience. He has supplemented his own knowledge, as he indicates in his Preface, by enlisting the aid of

numerous technicians, engineers, and artists. As a result the thirty chapters in "Television Program Production" reflect a wealth of practical experience, and are packed with useful, common sense information about the technical phases of production.

O'Meara's text is comprehensive and authoritative; it reveals very clearly that the understanding and co-ordination of many elements, both mechanical and human, are necessary if a program is to be produced efficiently. The book can thus be read advantageously by individuals already employed in the industry, as well as by students who contemplate a career in television.

There are, however, a few things in the book which I cannot accept. For example, O'Meara contends that in serious panel discussions it is obviously "good showmanship to select personalities who can be counted on to 'mix it up,'" and he also contends that it is good practice to select a moderator who can "subtly" promote "entertaining argument or conflict." I don't wish to appear stuffy, but it seems to me that when we broadcast what we claim to be a serious panel discussion we should concentrate more on enlightenment, and less on showmanship as such. Conflict can be employed as a legitimate interest factor in a serious discussion, to be sure, but it seems to me that the subtle promotion of an entertaining argument, while it might not interfere with efficient production, would certainly have a tendency to interfere with the unity of the production, unless the members of the panel were comedians.

Information on the jacket groups the various chapters according to camera operation and control, the use of graphic materials, etc. When *Television Program Production* is revised or given a second edition, I believe it would be advantageous to perform this job in the table of contents for the sake of greater clarity. I also believe that it would be an improvement if the six photographs which are part of Figure Five, DESIGNATION OF CAMERA SHOTS, were presented in proper four-to-three ratio for television.

On technical matters the book is excellent; when it occasionally encroaches on content material it is less satisfactory.

I like the book and will recommend it to my students.

JOSEPH H. NORTH,
Iowa State College

PREACHING THE WORD WITH AUTHORITY. By Frederick W. Schroeder. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1954; pp. 128. $2.50.

SPEAKING IN THE CHURCH. By John Edward Lantz. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1954; pp. ix+202. $3.75.

Both of these volumes were written by ministers who aimed to provide guidance and inspiration for theological students and beginning ministers. Both are concerned exclusively with the young minister's preaching problems. Both are brief, clear and readable.

The Rev. Dr. Schroeder, president of a theological seminary, concerns himself with the theory of preaching. In five chapters he discusses "The Defense of Preaching," "What it Means to Preach," "The Message of the Church," "Using Biblical Resources," and "Preaching with Authority." He defines preaching in the familiar words of Phillips Brooks, as "the communication of truth by man to men. It has in it two essential elements, truth and personality." He points out that the modern preacher is supported by a noble tradition; that he must preach the "whole counsel of God" and not overstress one particular doctrine or dogma; that the Bible ought to be his primary source of preaching materials; and that he can and must preach with the confidence and authority of divine grace that has been imparted to him.

Little concern is expressed for the mechanics of organization or delivery. Schroeder makes the point that "the ability to preach convincingly is partly the gift of God's grace. . . . However . . . due cognizance must be given to the human factor. This includes something as ordinary and mundane as the minister's professional competence." The speech student will be disappointed, however, to read in the same context that "mere oratory [will not] carry conviction. People are easily carried away by eloquence; but except for the spell it casts at the moment its influence is short-lived." Those of us who have devoted our lives to improving the processes of oral communication would insist that true oratory is never "mere" and usually its influence is not "short-lived."

On the other hand, the Rev. Mr. Lantz, a practicing minister and preacher, concerns himself with "the art and science of speaking as it applies to . . . the church." His volume is an exposition of classical and modern rhetorical theory and techniques, with illustrative ma-

terial taken exclusively from the common experiences of preachers.

The book opens with a brief discussion of various purposes of speaking in the church. Then follows three chapters on fundamental principles of the preacher's preparation and use of his mind, body and voice. The next two chapters suggest techniques for the attraction, interesting and persuasion of a congregation, particularly through "spiritual appeals." The final chapter discusses "the principle of appropriateness" and "appropriateness for various occasions," such as worship services, weddings, funerals, conferences, business meetings and social affairs. At the end of each chapter are suggested individual and group projects for practice of the principles treated in the text.

Both of these volumes should prove interesting and profitable to the preacher. The Schroeder book provides food for thought in the theory and philosophy of preaching; the Lantz volume presents rhetorical principles in forms likely to prove helpful to anyone who desires to improve his preaching techniques.

WILLIAM H. BOS,
Detroit Institute of Technology

A MOUSE IN THE CORNER. By Dorothy Will Simon. Illustrated by Patricia Holston. New York: Exposition Press, Inc.; pp. 63. $2.50.

One who reviews a book is expected to bring a "fine objectivity" (by which is meant some sort of personal detachment) to his task. The writer would be something less than honest if he did not acknowledge at the outset that his reading of Dorothy Simon's *A Mouse in the Corner* was illumined by his long acquaintance with the author and her family. He knew these poems were the productions of an indomitable effort to assuage the acute and progressive suffering which made sleep impossible. He is not able, therefore, to say that the very real tears evoked by his first reading of these poems were not due in considerable measure to his knowledge of what lay behind the text. However, he is sure that, with very few exceptions, the equally genuine chuckles they provoked were not in any way dependent on his knowing the Simons; the fun too completely transcends the travail through which it came. This he can say: that when he read a group of Mouse's musings to an audience of 250 University of Hawaii students, none of whom know the author; many of them wept (apparently as deeply touched as the faculty members who do know her), and the electric silence of rapt attention attested that all were moved. And again, all burst into thoughtful but very merry laughter—the highest tribute to excellent humor.

A Mouse in the Corner is a moving little volume, rich with the warmth of worthy living and of human understanding. A line of Robinson Jeffers comes to mind: "I have learned that happiness is important, but pain *gives* importance."

Mrs. Simon is highly articulate; she is able to translate those so desperately important little things into that poetic form which produces illuminating experience in the reader. But she is not concerned only with the little things. With the rare economy of the true artist, and quite without banality, she deals with suffering and death.

The title, *A Mouse in the Corner*, may be misleading at first. These are not children's poems, although children will love them (as the writer has already amply proved to his own satisfaction). Mrs. Simon explains the title in her preface: "This small volume evolved because of the often heard comment, 'How I'd like to have been a mouse in the corner when that happened!'"

Nearly every poem is an intimate, but always delicate, revelation of an experience, one poignant and sharp but never bitter, another ironic but never supercilious, still another sheer fun, and so on. Only one or two are frankly philosophical. None is longer than a page and a half. Most are vignettes, really—cameo-like in the precision of their making.

The variety of her metrical patterns proves Mrs. Simon a mature prosodist. She has that sense of sound which marks the true poet. She can catch the liquid beauty of a Hawaiian night:

> Star-studded skeins, freed from the sun,
> Are woven, warp and woof with breeze
> Of silk, and scent of blossom'd trees—
> Laced lightly with love's lyric sighs,
> Then tossed, frail fabric, to the skies.

Or lend sonic humor to a tantrum:

> Frantic Fanny
> "Flipped her lid!"
> "Foolish!" frowned friends.

Or give shotgun strength to ideas:

> "Thou Shalt Not Kill."
> "Oh, not again! That messy paint,
> Smeared clay—your clothes—the walls! A saint
> Would lose his patience. How I've tried!"
> The light of genius flickered—died.

There are an even fifty poems in this little

volume. They cover an astonishing range, as the two following illustrate:

Continual Faux Pas
Inevitably
Indubitably
With grave inscrutability
I'm asked by some official
For a card
I've lost! Debility?

Star-led
The plain of Pain surrounded me—
And Anguish flicked me fiendishly.
Ahead lay crags to climb—surmount.
Of journeys there I had lost count.
I knew the tortuous trail ahead,
Bereft of blessings—where it led,
The pitfalls planned by devils' spawn—
Grim nights and days of fighting on.
"Oh, not again!" I cried. "Dear God,
I can't retrace that road I've trod!
I've lost all strength of mind and limb."
I slumped to earth. "My soul to Him—"
I had begun, when loud and clear
Came, "Mother! Can you help me here?
I know not which way I should go."
Distraught, I prayed for help, and lo—
In answer to my desperate plea
Love, Faith, and Courage came to me.
With them I struggled to my feet,
My child had needs that I must meet.
I stumbled forward, head held high,
My eyes, this time, upon the sky.

Teachers of interpretation will welcome *A Mouse in the Corner*. Since the poems are short, well formed, widely varied in poetic pattern, and rich in emotive contrasts (tears and laughter are fused into perfect union in a single poem, *Modern Marvel*), they are a gold mine for the student of oral reading.

The attractiveness of the book itself is greatly enhanced by Patricia Holston's delightful drawings of the eavesdropping Mouse, who, according to Mrs. Simon's own confession, is responsible for the fifty poems. Those who read this little book will find themselves richer and better persons.

JOSEPH F. SMITH,
University of Hawaii

BRIEFLY NOTED

SPEAKING FOR THE MASTER. By Batsell Barrett Baxter. New York. The Macmillan Co., 1954; pp. ix+134. $2.50.

Writing a condensed handbook, Dr. Baxter seeks to aid classes arranged in churches to develop beginning speakers to take their simple "first steps" in speech training. Acknowledging his indebtedness to Brigance, Monroe, and Dale Carnegie, the author advises the individual studying the book alone, and the men's training classes under capable leadership, regarding sixteen topics such as The Importance of Learning to Speak Well, Stage Fright and What to do About It, Making Announcements, Reading the Bible, and the like. There is a brief bibliography, and the Appendix includes a "Case History Questionnaire" and an "Evolution Chart."

CHARLES A. MCGLON,
Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

PASTORAL PREACHING. By David A. MacLennan. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1955; pp. 157. $2.50.

WHO SPEAKS FOR GOD? By Gerald Kennedy. New York: Abingdon Press, 1954; pp. 139. $2.50.

Pastoral Preaching by David A. MacLennan (Yale University Divinity School) is one of the better recent books in the field of homiletics. The term "pastoral" in the title really means "effective." Preaching, in order to serve adequately its proper function, must have the breadth of pastoral concern (dealing with the entire range of human needs) and the depth of pastoral concern (the approach of sympathetic understanding). More specifically: preaching is not moralizing and giving advice on this or that; and it is not an exposition of ideas, doctrinal or otherwise; it is an instrumentality through which people are brought into contact with God (thus meeting their needs).

In discussing the resources and methods of the preacher, MacLennan is less helpful. He is always interesting, but he falls into some of the vague generalizations which are a part of traditional ways of thinking. An exception, however, should be noted: his treatment of contemporary fiction. One wishes he had done as much for the Bible, particularly since he underscores so heavily its importance in preaching.

A worthy companion-book for the student of homiletics is *Who Speaks for God?* by Gerald Kennedy (one of the younger bishops of the Methodist Church and a distinguished preacher). MacLennan deals with the function and methodology of preaching and Kennedy provides an example of the practitioner's art. From a different direction, Kennedy sounds the note struck by MacLennan. The preacher, if he

is to speak for God, must always be concerned for *persons* and their stake in the issues of the day.

E. WINSTON JONES,
Boston University

BOOKS RECEIVED

HOW SHOULD EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES BE INCREASED FOR THE YOUTH OF THE UNITED STATES? Volume I, Youth Education. Edited by Bower Aly. Columbia, Missouri: Artcraft Press, 1955; pp. 220. $1.50.

HOW SHOULD EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES BE INCREASED FOR THE YOUTH OF THE UNITED STATES? Volume II, Youth Education. By Bower Aly. Columbia, Missouri: Artcraft Press, 1955; pp. 220. $1.50.

JOHN WESLEY ON PULPIT ORATORY. Revised and abridged by Ross E. Price. Kansas City, Missouri: The Beacon Hill Press, 1955; pp. 21. $.25.

PARENTS AND CHILDREN. By C. W. Valentine. New York: The Philosophical Library, 1955; pp. xi+212. $3.75.

WORLDWIDE COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES. Edited by F. Bowen Evans. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1955; pp. xiii+222. $3.00.

CURRENT TRENDS IN PSYCHOLOGY AND THE BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES. By John T. Wilson, Clellan S. Ford, B. F. Skinner, Gustav Bergmann, Frank A. Beach, and Karl Pribram. Pittsburgh: The University of Pittsburgh Press, 1955; pp. xvi+142. $4.00.

EXPERIMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY. Edited by B. A. Farrell. New York: The Philosophical Library, 1955; pp. xi+66. $2.75.

SCHOLARSHIPS, FELLOWSHIPS AND LOANS. By S. Norman Feingold. Volume III. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Bellman Publishing Company, 1955; pp. 471. $10.00.

CHARACTER AND OPINION IN THE UNITED STATES. By George Santayana. New York: George Braziller, 1955; pp. 130. $2.75.

THE McGRAW-HILL AUTHOR'S BOOK. New York: The McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1955; pp. 88.

CRUCIAL ISSUES IN EDUCATION: AN ANTHOLOGY. Edited by Henry Ehlers. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1955; pp. x+277. $2.25.

PHILOSOPHIES OF EDUCATION IN CULTURAL PERSPECTIVE. By Theodore Brameld. New York: The Dryden Press, 1955; pp. xvii+446. $4.50.

ARE MEN EQUAL: AN INQUIRY INTO THE MEANING OF AMERICAN DEMOCRACY. By Henry Alonzo Myers. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1955; pp. 188. $1.45.

JOHN DEWEY: HIS CONTRIBUTION TO THE AMERICAN TRADITION. By Irwin Edman. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1955; pp. 315. $3.50.

THE STORY OF YOUNG EDWIN BOOTH. By Alma Power-Waters. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, 1955; pp. 192. $2.75.

TWENTIETH CENTURY AUTHORS. Edited by Stanley J. Kunitz. New York: H. W. Wilson Co., 1955; pp. vii+1123. $8.00.

EXPRESSION OF THE EMOTIONS IN MAN AND ANIMALS. By Charles Darwin. New York: Philosophical Library, 1955; pp. xi+372. $6.00.

GUIDE TO MODERN ENGLISH. By Richard K. Corbin and Porter G. Perrin. New York: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1955; pp. 528. $3.20.

THE PEDIATRIC YEARS. By Louis Spekter. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, 1955; pp. xxv+734. $12.50.

POEMS AND SONGS OF ROBERT BURNS. By James Barke. London: Collins, 1955; pp. 736. $1.50.

THE HERO IN HISTORY. By Sidney Hook. Boston: The Beacon Press, 1955; pp. xiv+273. $1.25.

THE CONFIDENT YEARS, 1885-1915. By Van Wyck Brooks. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, 1955; pp. viii+620.

ENGLISH PROSE STYLE. By Herbert Read. Boston: Beacon Press, 1955; pp. xiv+216. $1.25.

SHOP TALK

LOREN REID, *Editor*

THE 1955 CONVENTION at Los Angeles will be the last annual meeting of the Speech Association of America operating under the old constitution. Beginning January, 1956, the Association will be shaped by new legislating and planning groups.

Los Angeles will, however, be the scene of various activities necessary to enable the Association to move smoothly from the old constitution to the new.

The Executive Council, for example, will turn over its responsibilities to the Administrative Council, a relatively small group of twenty-five, which hereafter will manage the business and the finances of the Association. An even more far-reaching change is the inauguration of a Legislative Assembly, a new, highly-important, policy-making group. As the Assembly will represent various areas, interest groups, and regional and national organizations, it will become an influential part of the Association. Still another innovation is the formation of Interest Groups. Many interest groups are now organized, and others will no doubt perfect their structure in Los Angeles, in time to work with the First Vice-President of the Association in planning the 1956 convention at Chicago.

In the September issue of *Speech News,* Magdalene Kramer reviews the important changes that the new constitution brings about; and *QJS* at various times has called attention to the new aspects of the situation. Right now Shop Talk wants to underscore the responsibility that will rest on the shoulders of the members of the 1955 Nominating Committee, three members of which were elected by the membership during November. These three members, plus the two to be named by the Executive Council, will nominate two candidates for Second Vice-President; four candidates for two posts in the Administrative Council; and 276 candidates for 138 positions on the Legislative Assembly. In other words the Nominating Committee will pick two persons for every position, giving the entire membership an opportunity to make a selection right down the line.

No subsequent nominating committee will have so formidable a task as will the five persons given this assignment in 1955. They will indeed need to have suggestions of nominees from many people; and they will also need a good deal of wisdom, common sense, good judgment, and statesmanship.

ONE OF THE PROVISIONS of the new constitution that will take some time to get under way is that set forth in Article III of the By-Laws. A part of Section 3 reads: ". . . the regional and state associations may recommend candidates to the Nominating Committee, nominations to be in the hands of the Chairman of the Committee not later than the first day of the annual meeting." The Los Angeles nominating committee will certainly welcome these lists of names. Its task would be easier if it could have suggestions from every state and regional organization, but, quite likely, this part of the nominating procedure will take time to develop.

Section 4 of the same article may get

considerable attention over the years. This section provides that any twenty-five members of the Association may, by petition, propose additional nominations for any position. Since under the new constitution the nominating committee is to propose two names for each post, groups may feel more free to submit additional nominations than they do under the present constitution.

THE ANNOUNCEMENT from Ted DeLay's Committee on Special Tours, recently distributed from the Executive Secretary's Office, indicates that convention goers will have a chance to broaden their education in more ways than one.

Certainly the opportunity to tour the great TV stations of Los Angeles, the theatrical supply houses, the moving picture studios (a different one each day, the circular states), all under the aegis of the Committee on Local Arrangements, at a modest cost, should appeal to everybody (except the members of the Nominating Committee, who will be working on that list of 282 names). Turnabout Theatre is another institution of which Los Angeles is justly proud; if you have never seen it, you have missed a luminous experience. In all the circular listed two full pages of tours, even including one to old, decrepit, flea-bitten Tia Juana. And for New Year's you can take your choice between going to Ensenada, located on the wild, rock-bound coast of Lower California, or staying in Los Angeles and bracing yourself for the Rose Bowl.

Everyone, moreover, will have a chance to stay in the fabulous Los Angeles Statler, especially if you have already made your reservation. The rates, according to the card, start at $6.50 for a single and go up as high as you like, maybe even higher. Don't, however, demand the upper hammock in the lower boiler room—Shop Talk has already reserved that.

The Western folks have certainly done themselves proud in making these and many other local plans for the national convention.

NOTHING IS SO EXCITING as the first year of a new experience. One of our correspondents is suddenly finding himself involved in technical dramatics, without much specific preparation. He writes as follows: "Recently I was going to have a meeting of the entire stage crew to set up the flats of both acts, for sight lines. But I came across a book in the library called *Proscenium and Sight Lines*, and although it sounded pretty specialized, I was tired of looking at books that began, 'Let's go backstage. We see a man in front of a large board with a lot of levers on it. Look! As the man moves a lever, the lights get dim.' This new book was just what I needed; it told how to measure the widest points of the auditorium; how to draw your set to scale, and get all sight lines, horizontal and vertical, done on paper. Several problems that I had unforeseen I managed to solve on paper, with practically no fuss. Really amazing how close to sheer anarchy I had been.

"It's just marvellous what you can do if you know whom to see or what to read."

THE 1955 CROP of June graduates who began their teaching careers this fall in the public schools of the country is drawing down a salary of from $3150 to $4000, according to a random sampling now being conducted by Shop Talk. We mailed letters of inquiry to superintendents all over the country, mostly keeping to cities of 10,000 and up, and have so far had returns from California, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, Ohio, Texas, Utah, Virginia, and Washington.

The average starting salary for the lot was $3450. A master's degree is worth, on the average, $212 a year more, ranging from $100 in some systems to $400 in one. All of these figures, of course, are based on the relatively small number of replies that had landed on our desk at the time of going to press.

At the end of a year's successful service, the beginner can look forward to an increment for the following year of $90, $100, $175, or $200—to quote a few of the schedules. In most instances the annual increments are the same

for holders of master's as for holders of bachelor's degrees, although in a few instances the M.A. people not only start a little higher but move along a little faster.

The two factors having the greatest bearing on teachers' salaries are educational preparation and experience. Preference is given to the holding of one or more degrees, but graduate study apart from degrees carries weight in arriving at a salary figure. And as to experience, teachers who give satisfactory service are advanced one notch up the scale at each promotion period (normally each year).

A few of the systems give additional stipends to those teachers carrying extra curricular responsibilities. The direction of debate or dramatics, for example, might bring in an extra $100 or $200 a year. A couple of the systems offered the speech clinician an extra $100 a year.

Without exception the schools sampled paid the same schedule to high school, junior high, and elementary school teachers. Occasionally, however, if the school board operated a junior college, it offered the college teachers a slightly higher stipend.

The merit raise is seldom found in secondary school schedules. Beginners who entered the same school system last September, and started off at identical salaries, will each be receiving identical salaries for the year beginning September, 1959. If they started at $3600, and received annual increments of $200, they would each have advanced to $4100. In a few systems, however, an outstanding teacher can look forward to an additional raise, above and beyond the schedule, for superior performance.

All of us need to work steadily at the problem of recruiting new teachers. One argument that can be used is that beginning salaries for high school teachers are now about—not quite—as high as for most other vocations. The average beginning high school teacher gets more than the average beginner in journalism or business, gets less than the average beginning engineer. Where teachers suffer is in the fact that salary ceilings are still too low. But a bright, attractive girl who thinks she would like to teach in the public schools for a while, and then get married, does not need to worry about ceilings. She can reap the advantage of the favorable beginning salaries. A bright, attractive young man has a different problem. He needs to travel the Ph.D. route and head for the colleges and universities. That takes a few years. By then, as the demand for college teachers becomes stronger, the ceilings will improve.

ALL DEPARTMENTS ARE AGAIN INVITED to send contributions to any issue of Shop Talk. A few of the larger departments appoint a member of the staff as its news editor; this person gathers the items and mails them in.

The handling of copy is easier if all contributors use a separate sheet of paper for each item. This procedure greatly simplifies the task of collating and editing. When such a budget of news arrives, we can give the personals to the Personals Clerk, the theatre schedules to the Theatre Schedules Clerk, and the Miscellaneous Pithy Items to the Miscellaneous Pithy Items clerk. She arranges these in a proper order, and before you know it Shop Talk is on its way to the printer.

Some departments send us bundles of mimeographed miscellany. We love these departments too, but we are not as grateful to them, to quote Pogo, as you maybe suppose. We like the special correspondents better; their stuff is slanted to our readers, and is likely to be fresher and timelier.

Your news may be more interesting to others than you realize. Many write in to say that they enjoy learning where their friends are locating, and how they are getting along. Some readers follow the theatre schedules avidly, just to see what schools are producing what.

We would especially like to get more news about changes in the curriculum. One of our large departments, for example, no longer requires the second language for the Ph.D. Most departments no longer require a thesis for the M.A. On one campus a new department of speech is organized; on another it is incorporated into a school or division. Communications courses come and go. If these and similar changes can be reported as they occur, all of us will have a better picture of the total situation.

THE SUDDEN DEPARTURE of a friend is always shocking, and our learning of the death of Harry Barnes was especially so. The news came to us late in the fall, in the form of a communication which was printed in the last issue of Shop Talk.

Our paths crossed at many points, as they did at Grinnell College and Vermillion, South Dakota, and later ran side by side, as they did at the State University of Iowa. Both of us were candidates for the doctoral degree in those grim depression days when no one quite knew whether a Ph.D. were to be had in the field of speech, and whether one could earn anything with it even if it were. About

that time Harry Barnes had decided to leave the field of dramatics, in which he had been active, and in which he had taught many university classes, and turn his energies to the exploration of speech fundamentals, and study, to use a phrase he made famous, the "needs and abilities" of beginners in speech. In this new area he quickly won recognition. His *Speech Handbook* proved to be a publishing phenomenon, even in the days when it was privately printed and depended for its circulation on the recommendation of one teacher to another.

Harry Barnes was a fine classroom performer. He was alive and stimulating. He enjoyed large classes wherever he taught. On our private and personal list of great teachers his name is written in large letters. But whereas some of the good classroom performers are reserved or formal or austere in conference, he was at his best in helping a student unravel a problem. He was unbelievably wise. Students left his office with their heads a little higher and their self-esteem a little stronger. In this land there must be a thousand men and women who will say that this was so. This great talent he carried with him to the end of his days.

IMAGINE OUR ASTONISHMENT when, reading the October 1 issue of the *Saturday Evening Post*, founded by another master of shop talk, Benj. Franklin, we learned that it had adopted a bright, brand-new format. We looked at the crisp, clean pages with the wide margins and the airy spaces around the pictures, and decided that progress had really come to Philadelphia. We found ourselves peering through our trifocals at the new type face used for the editorial matter, and, lo, it was our old friend, Baskerville.

Baskerville, you see, is the type face used by that other sterling publication of national circulation, the *Quarterly Journal of Speech*. One of our former editors, W. Norwood Brigance, studying the typography of the journal as he was about to begin his term of office, made a careful study of type faces, and, having a keen eye for legibility and attractiveness, selected Baskerville. At that time our printer did not have it in his type catalog, but he was glad enough to acquire it. All of this happened in 1942, thirteen years ago, showing that old *QJS* is something of a trend-setter.

It is worth recording that shortly after *QJS* adopted its new type style, its circulation made a notable increase. We understand *SEP* is having similar good fortune with its new format. Our scouts quietly inform us that the combined circulation of the two periodicals (known in informed circles as the Baskerville group) has now reached the impressive total of 5,006,112.

A SERIES OF television programs on great orators began over WHA-TV, Madison, Wisconsin, October 26, co-sponsored by the University of Wisconsin Extension Division and the Speech Department. F. W. Haberman is host for the series, conducting an interview with a person considered an expert on each orator. In addition, an actor delivers some of the words made famous by the speaker. Among the orators being discussed are Pericles, Demosthenes, Cicero, Mirabeau, Chatham, Burke, Patrick Henry, Lincoln, Booker T. Washington, F. D. Roosevelt, and Churchill. Kinescopes of the programs will be sent to five commercial television stations in Wisconsin, and study guides will be provided for a non-credit course. Gary Nathanson is producer-director, and Shirley Shapiro is research assistant.

THE ASSOCIATION FOR PROFESSIONAL BROADCASTING EDUCATION elected as its president Sidney W. Head, chairman of the University of Miami Radio-TV-Film Department. Other officers are Rex Howell, manager, KFXJ, Grand Junction, Colorado, vice-president and Russell Porter, University of Denver, secretary-treasurer. APBE jointly represents the interest of commercial broadcasters and colleges and universities engaged in professional training for the field. Among the projects planned by APBE are the publication of a scholarly journal to be called *Journal of Broadcasting*, and formation of a center in Washington for exchange of employment information for graduates of member institutions. Charter institutional members include major universities in all parts of the country.

THE DEPARTMENT OF SPEECH and the Division of Community Service of Brooklyn College sponsored a public debate, recently playing host to the touring Cambridge University team. Split teams were used on the motion: "The hydrogen bomb is the worst of man's many mistakes." University of Wisconsin debaters met the Cambridge speakers on the topic, "The rearmament of Western Germany is detrimental to the best interests of the free world."

THE ANNUAL WISCONSIN PLAYERS playwriting contest has been announced for the current year. Designed to help induce more vigorous and

original thinking in American playwriting, the competition sets no limitations as to theme or form. Contest details and entry blanks may be secured from Wisconsin Players, Memorial Union, University of Wisconsin, Madison 6, Wisconsin.

THE ANNUAL SPEECH CONFERENCE, sponsored by the Department of Speech at the University of Michigan, was held on July 15 and 16. Participating in the program as guest speakers were: the following officers of the Speech Association of America: Thomas A. Rousse, president; Lester Thonssen, first vice-president; Kenneth G. Hance, executive vice-president; Waldo W. Braden, executive secretary; J. Jeffery Auer, editor, *Speech Monographs*. Other guest speakers were: Harlan H. Bloomer, president, American Speech and Hearing Association: Fr. G. V. Hartke, president, American Educational Theatre Association; Charles L. Balcer, president, Central States Speech Association; Gordon E. Peterson, editor, *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders;* Sara Lowrey, Department of Speech, Furman University, Greenville, South Carolina; Warren Guthrie, chairman, Department of Speech, Western Reserve University; and Robert Hudson, program coordinator, Educational Television and Radio Center, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

LEADING SPECIALISTS in the field of speech therapy, physical medicine, special education and psychology participated in a symposium as part of United Cerebral Palsy's Sixth Annual Convention, in Boston, Mass, November 11-13.

Among the participants were: Maurice H. Fouracre, head, Department of Special Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City; Marian L. Gilmore, consultant, Cleveland Hearing and Speech Center, Western Reserve University, Cleveland; Sarah Jane Houtz, assistant professor of physical medicine and rehabilitation, University of Illinois Research and Educational Hospital, Urbana.

THE TWENTY-FOURTH consecutive session of Shady Trails, University of Michigan Speech Improvement Camp, convened at the camp site on the shores of Grand Traverse Bay near Northport, Michigan, June 27. The eight-week session featured an intensive training program in the areas of stuttering, post-operative cleft palate, mild cerebral palsy, hard-of-hearing, and articulation.

The resident staff of thirty-eight members included twenty-two speech correctionists, fifteen of which were interns, and eleven physical education counselors. Visiting staff included Harold Westlake of Northwestern University, Wendell Johnson of the State University of Iowa, and John Irwin of the University of Wisconsin.

SHOP TALK CALENDAR

Speech Association of America, Western Speech Association, American Educational Theatre Association, American Forensic Association, National Society for the Study of Communication, Committee on Discussion and Debate Materials: Hotel Statler, Los Angeles, December 28, 29, 30. (Some preliminary committee and council meetings on December 26 and 27.)

Central States Speech Association: Hotel Sherman, Chicago, April 6-7. Two 1957 dates have been announced: Hotel Leamington, Minneapolis, April 5-6; Hotel Sherman, Chicago, December 27-28.

Southern Speech Association: Forrest Hotel, Hattiesburg, Miss., April 2-7.

Speech Association of the Eastern States: Hotel Statler, New York, April 12-14.

(Secretaries of other organizations are invited to list their convention dates in Shop Talk's calendar.)

Other conventions for the Speech Association of America are now scheduled as follows:

1956: Conrad Hilton Hotel, Chicago, December 27-29.
1957: Hotel Statler, Boston, August 25-28.
1958: Conrad Hilton Hotel, Chicago, December 29-31.
1959: Hotel Statler, Washington, December 28-30.
1960: The Jefferson, St. Louis, December 28-30.
1961: Hotel Statler, New York, December.
1962: Hotel Cleveland, Cleveland, December.

WILLAMETTE UNIVERSITY'S Speech and Drama Department is now housed in the new Fine Arts and Auditorium Building. The structure, one of three dedicated on the campus October 1, contains a 1,250 seat auditorium with three-manual pipe organ, the latest in stage equipment and radio and television control facilities. The Fine Arts wings include a debate lounge, experimental theatre, painting terrace, rooms for ceramics, graphics, drawing and weaving plus an art gallery done completely in Philippine mahogany.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS Department of Speech in cooperation with the University of Illinois Summer Session and the State Division of Services for Crippled Children, sponsored the eleventh annual Summer Residential Center for handicapped children, June 26-August 5. Thirty-six children, ages 10 to 17, were in attendance. L. W. Olson was coordinator of the program; J. C. Kelly, E. Thayer Curry, and Francis Johnson served as speech and hearing supervisor, supervisor of audiological measurements and evaluations, and supervisor of cleft palate cases, respectively.

DURING THE 1955 Summer Session, the Radio-TV staff of the Speech Department presented a special program on the theme for the University of Michigan Summer Session, "Michigan in History." The program began with a half-hour on-stage presentation of a radio drama written by a student, Dale Stevenson, which dealt with the history of the state. This was followed by the showing of a 15 minute kinescope, from the University of Michigan TV series, on the Soo Locks, and an original TV drama, "Mason of Michigan," by Bethany Wilson. The script treats of what is impressively called "The Toledo War" and focuses on Stevens T. Mason, first governor of Michigan, who, at the age of 26 appropriately came to be known as "the boy-governor of Michigan." This also was an on-stage presentation to acquaint the audience with production techniques and procedures.

Two Vidicon cameras will be purchased for instructional use to supplement the four image Orthicon cameras now being used in the TV studios. Installation will be in December.

ONE OF ITALY'S eminent dramatists, Diego Fabbri, will be introduced to American audiences this month when his play, *The Unexpected Truth*, receives it premiere in this country at the Yale University Theatre. In Milan, where it had a three-month run, it was produced under the title of *The Trial of Jesus*. F. Curtis Canfield, dean of the School of Drama, is director.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS has introduced a new course, "Appreciation and Criticism of the Motion Picture." It includes a study of the principles of cinematic art with special attention to the understanding and evaluation of the motion picture. The course is taught by Henry Mueller.

APPOINTMENTS

Adrian College: Herbert L. Smith, professor of English and speech, chairman of the Division of Humanities

Bradley University: Robert Cagle, director of dramatics; Leon Aufdenberger, instructor in speech; Michael Cody, William Colsch, graduate assistants.

Brooklyn College: Charles E. Parkhurst, Bernard Barrow, Mrs. Sidney Berman, Stanley Handleman, Barbara Matés, Stanley E. Weisberger.

Fresno State College: Margaret Dutton.

Fairleigh Dickinson College: Edwin Cooperstein, director of television and radio.

Lake Erie College: Clyde Blakeley, instructor in design, technical director of the Lake Erie College-Community Theatre.

Los Angeles State College: Robert S. Cathcart, assistant professor of speech; Jack B. Cullen, assistant professor of speech education; Ted S. DeLay, assistant professor of drama; William E. Schlosser, assistant professor of drama; Laura Chase, instructor of speech; Robert W. Gillen, instructor of speech correction.

McMurry College: William K. Clark, chairman of the Department of Speech, associate professor of speech; Maurice Pullig, instructor in Speech, director of drama.

Memphis State College: Joseph H. Riggs, instructor in speech fundamentals.

Ohio Northern University: Doyle Smith, theatre staff.

Ohio University: Edward Penson, assistant professor of dramatic art and speech; Paul Reyes, F. Craig Johnson, instructors in dramatic art and speech; William Beattie, Holmes Easley, Mervyn Falk, Susannah Lane, Margaret Phillips, Andrew Stasik, Roman Syroid, William Galarno, graduate assistants.

Purdue University: Lowell Matson, assistant professor of speech, associate director of Purdue Playshop; Alice O. Lowder, Frank Hancock, graduate assistants in theatre.

Queens College: Norbert Rodeman, assistant professor of radio and television; Leola Horowitz, instructor; Raymond D. Gaspar, instructor; Paul Libin, college assistants in speech; Sofia Marko, college assistant in speech; Joyce L. Diamant, college assistant in speech; Martin Horwit, college assistant in speech; Jon Eisenson, director speech and hearing center; Janet Mann, psychologist; Herbert Freudenberger, Martin Horwit, Marie Fontana, Alan Levy, Robert Rosenbaum, clinicians.

Richmond Professional Institute: Elizabeth Birbari, costume director; William H. Lockey, Jr., technical director; Lucile Ness, instructor in acting and oral interpretation.

Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary: Winton H. Beaven, professor of communication.

University of Arizona: Frank Barrica, instructor in radio, assistant in the Radio Bureau; Vilma Boros, instructor in speech.

University of Houston: Stanley K. Hamilton, chairman of the drama department; Joseph M. Coffer, staff director; Frank G. Bock, technical director; Ed Pincoffs, assistant professor of speech; Robert Olian, instructor and associate director of forensics.

University of Illinois: Martin T. Cobin, assistant professor of speech; Webster Smalley, instructor in speech; Jack D. Armould, Gordon Beck, Dale Benson, Mary Ann Brown, Joyce Chalcraft, Wade Curry, Charles Davies, Mary Cay Doan, Carol Finkelhor, Richard Hoops, Virginia Johnson, Robert Keel, Robert Kully, Wilfred Leach, Jay Ludwig, Charlene Owen, Jacqueline Peiper, Kathleen Preston, Hermann Stelzner, David Strother, Jamil Toubbeh, and Marvin Ulmer, graduate teaching assistants; Thomas Fay, Sanford Gerber, and Robert Nagel, graduate research assistants; Sara Latham and Stephen Quigley, graduate fellowships.

University of Maryland: Sara Conlon, instructor in speech correction; Raymond T. Bedwell, instructor in radio and television; George J. Dillavou and John E. Gow, instructors in speech composition and rhetoric; Phyllis Bosley, Annette Monroe, Janet Smith, junior instructors in public speaking.

University of Michigan: Jim Bob Stephenson, Robert Reinhart, instructor.

Texas College of Arts and Industries: Josephine Moran, instructor in speech.

West Virginia University: Harold Y. Hunker, Donald Mullins, Charles Neel, Stanley Rives, Theodore N. Smith, instructors; Nancy Mylius, Clyde Richey, graduate assistants.

University of Wisconsin: Ordean G. Ness, assistant professor of speech; Firman H. Brown, Patricia L. Crocker, Roger Forster, Philip R. Groh, Ted Jackson, Richard F. Mason, William L. Ristow, Mary Jane Stevenson, teaching assistants; Charles Schmitt, Bernhard R. Works, theatre assistants; Emily Farnum, research assistant; Jerry C. McNeely, departmental fellow; Joel Dick, Knapp fellow; Janet L. Tiefenthaler, Wisconsin scholar.

PROMOTIONS

Bradley University: Lillian Aitchison, assistant professor of oral interpretation; Henry Vander Heyden, assistant professor and director of radio and television.

Brooklyn College: Marvin Bauer, professor of speech.

Los Angeles State College: James J. Stansell, acting chairman in the Division of Language Arts; Louis G. Gardemal, associate professor of drama; Malcolm O. Sillars, assistant professor of speech.

Purdue University: Sam Marks, associate professor of speech.

University of Delaware: Thomas S. Watson, technical director and instructor in dramatic arts and speech.

University of Illinois: E. Thayer Curry and J. Wesley Swanson, professors; Henry L. Mueller and Joseph W. Scott, associate professors; Marie Orr Shere, assistant professor.

University of Maryland: Lyle V. Mayer, assistant professor of speech.

West Virginia University: Martin T. Cobin, associate professor; Robert J. Greene, assistant professor.

THEATRE SCHEDULES

Bradley University Theatre: *Our Town.*

Brooklyn College: George Gershwin Theatre: *Death of a Salesman, George Washington Slept Here, Street Scene, Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme, Man and Superman.*

Catawba College: *Family Portrait, Juno and the Paycock, The Other Side of the Fence, The Importance of Being Earnest.*

Children's Educational Theatre of Maryland: *Little Women, Hansel and Gretel, Cinderella, Dick Whittington and His Cat, Little Plays for Little People, Tom Sawyer.*

Fresno State College: *Bell, Book and Candle, The Lady's Not for Burning, The Caine Mutiny Court Martial.*

Iowa State College: *Street Scene, Uncle Vanya, The Crucible, Gianni Schicchi, The Cat and the Canary, Elizabeth the Queen, Mexican Folk Plays.*

Los Angeles State College: *Golden Boy, Androcles and the Lion, A Christmas Carol.*

Memphis State College: *The Enchanted, Night Must Fall, Second Threshold, Merchant of Venice.* Children's Theatre: *Rumpelstiltskin.*

Ohio University: Ohio Valley Summer Theatre: *Mister Roberts, My Three Angels, Streetcar Named Desire, Mr. Barry's Etchings, High Ground, The Fifth Season.* School year: *The Male Animal, Pygmalion, Dial M for Murder,*

The Browning Version, A Phoenix Too Frequent.

Purdue University: Purdue Playshop: *The Four Poster, Dark of the Moon, Picnic, Othello.*

Queens College: *Madwoman of Chaillot, Gammer Gurton's Needle.*

Texas College of Arts and Industries: *The Taming of the Shrew, Papa Is All.*

Texas Christian University (summer): *Sabrina Fair, Night Must Fall, My Three Angels, Picnic, Blithe Spirit.*

Texas Technological College (1954-55 season): *Green Grow the Lilacs, Blithe Spirit, Squaring the Circle, Arms and the Man.*

University of Connecticut: *An Ideal Husband, Taming of the Shrew, Dr. Faustus, The Father, Winterset.* Touring Players: *The Valiant, A Marriage Proposal, A Phoenix Too Frequent, The Municipal Davenport.*

University of Illinois: Summer, 1955: *Yes, My Darling Daughter; Mr. and Mrs. North; The Emperor's New Clothes.* Summer Youth Theatre: *scenes from Liliom, The Beaux' Stratagem, Alice Sit-by-the-Fire, The Taming of the Shrew.* School year: *Born Yesterday, King Lear, Hedda Gabler, The Caine Mutiny Court Martial, Man and Superman.*

University of Illinois, Chicago Undergraduate Division: *The Twelve Pound Look, Time Out for Ginger.*

University of Kansas: Fraser Theatre Series: *Picnic, Gammer Gurton's Needle, Carousel, Pygmalion, Cosi Fan Tutte.* Studio Theatre series: an evening of short plays. Children's Theatre: *The Land of the Dragon.* Arena Theatre: *The Menaechmi.* Touring Theatre: *Kind Lady.*

University of Maryland: Summer: *Mr. Roberts, The Women, The Warrior's Husband.* School year: *Holiday, Dark of the Moon, Importance of Being Earnest.*

University of Michigan: Summer: *Ring Round the Moon; Bell, Book and Candle; Heartbreak House; Fidelio.* School year: *The Good Woman of Setzuan, The World of Tommy Albright.*

University of Wisconsin: *Dial M for Murder, The Confidential Clerk, Gianni Schicchi, Trial by Jury, As You Like It, The Fifth Season.* Under student direction: *Maker of Dreams, Impasse, End of the Beginning, Bartholomew Fair.*

West Virginia University: *Dial M for Murder, The Caine Mutiny Court Martial, The Lady's Not for Burning, One Foot in Heaven.*

PERSONAL NOTES

William M. Sattler, associate professor of speech at the University of Michigan, addressed the third annual conference on Personnel Management at the House of Ludington in Escanaba, Michigan. The conference was sponsored by the Bureau of Industrial Relations and the University of Michigan Extension Service in cooperation with the Department of Speech. . . . Helen Garlington, Director of Music, Ecorse (Michigan) Public Schools, was a guest member of the summer staff. She was in charge of stage lighting and taught a course in the production of opera and pageant in high schools. . . . Thomas Rousse, chairman, Department of Speech, University of Texas, and president, Speech Association of America, was also a guest member of the summer staff. . . . On October 25, Marie-Hed Kaulhausen, Lektorin der Sprechkunde, of the University of Göttingen, presented a poetry reading program at the University of Wisconsin. Dr. Kaulhausen read from Goethe, Schiller, and other classical poets, and lectured on oral reading. She came to America to present one program at the University of Wisconsin, one at Wayne University, and one at the University of Utah.

James W. Abel, Brooklyn College, has returned from a year's special leave as visiting professor of English at Anatolia College, Thessaloniki, Greece. . . . Bernard Barrow, new lighting designer at Brooklyn, was summer director of the professional training program of the Oakdale Musical Theatre at Wallingford, Conn. and appeared in many of the theatre's productions. He also conducted a seminar at the newly-organized Shakespeare Institute held at Yale University during the last three weeks in August . . . Dorothy Lawson was an observer at the Institute for the Teaching of English to Foreigners at the University of London this summer. . . . Loretta Wagner Smith has been made vice-chairman of the Speech Education Committee of the Speech Association of the Eastern States. . . . Helen Roach attended the American Shakespeare Festival Academy and appeared in *The Tempest* and *Julius Caesar*. . . . Jacob Foster spoke on directing and stagecraft, using his own film strips, at the New Jersey Theatre Conference in June.

Robert B. Burrows, director of technical theater at West Virginia, is on a leave of absence. . . . Albert E. Johnson has recently been made chairman of the Department of Speech of Texas College of Arts and Industries. . . . Franklyn S. Haiman, assistant professor of speech at Northwestern University, and Pressley C. McCoy, chairman of Oral Communications at Dennison University, have each taken a year's leave of absence to teach speech com-

position and rhetoric in the University of Maryland's European program. . . . Wilbur E. Gilman of Queens College was visiting professor in speech at the University of Missouri, this summer. . . . Beatrice F. Jacoby was married to Charles Perinchief of Bermuda last April. . . . Jon Eisenson lectured on various phases of speech psychology and speech correction at universities in the Midwest and South during the summer. . . . Edward M. Greenberg was summer director of the country's largest musical tent arena theatre, the Warwick Musical Theatre, Warwick, R. I.

Harold P. Zelko of The Pennsylvania State University is on sabbatical leave this fall semester to write in the field of management communication and conference speaking. . . . Charlotte Wells, director of the Speech and Hearing Clinic of the University of Missouri, was guest speaker and consultant for the Oklahoma Speech and Drama Festival, held on the Oklahoma University campus September 30 and October 1. Dr. Wells lectured at two of the general sessions and talked with groups of elementary teachers and speech therapists. . . . Loren Reid gave an address in November at the general session of teachers of speech at the annual convention of the Louisiana Association of Education at Alexandria. . . . Ross D. Smith and Erling Kildahl of Purdue were active the last summer at Michiana Summer Theatre, Michigan City, Indiana. Dr Smith was Executive Director of Dunes Arts Foundation of which the theatre is a part, and Professor Kildahl was a director of the theatre.

Noel G. Rapp of Memphis State College completed his doctoral work at Purdue. His Ph.D. was conferred at the June convocation. . . . Eugene Bence was a visiting theatre director at the Summer Youth Camp at the University of Georgia. . . . George F. Sparks has been appointed Director of Forensics at the University of Arizona. W. Arthur Cable, who guided extracurricular speech activities at Arizona for many years, will continue to teach and to devote more time to research. . . . Klonda Lynn, head of the Speech Department at Arizona, was visiting professor of speech and English at Arizona State College at Flagstaff this summer. . . . George F. Sparks and Mrs. Sparks conducted a student tour to Europe this summer. England, Holland, Germany, Switzerland, Italy, and France were the countries visited. . . . The Speech Clinic, under the direction of James D. Lambert, has initiated this year a program of hearing tests for all new students at the University of Arizona. . . . Paul R. Beall, consultant and science editor in civil and military aviation, has returned to his home at Annapolis from Europe, where he accompanied General E. E. Partridge, commander-in-chief of the Continental Air Defence Command, to a NATO conference in Paris. Previously Dr. Beall had worked with General Partridge at Command Headquarters in Colorado Springs.

Charles Shattuck of the University of Illinois was on sabbatical leave in England from the end of February to early September, 1955. Most of that period was spent in London in research on English theatre. . . . J. Wesley Swanson was on sabbatical leave during the academic year 1954-55. In the course of research on the art of Edward Gordon Craig, Professor Swanson spent five months in London and the rest of his leave in France, Italy, Spain, and Portugal. . . . Barnard H. Hewitt will be on sabbatical leave during the second semester, 1955-56. He will do research on materials available for studies in the American theatre, including collections in private hands. . . . *Audio-Visual Speech Reading*, a booklet by James C. Kelly, associate professor of speech, contains exercises for teaching speech-reading to hard-of-hearing children. A limited number of copies is available to interested persons. . . . During the past summer, Marie Hochmuth taught at the University of California, Los Angeles, and Henry Mueller taught at Columbia University Teachers College. . . . Naomi W. Hunter, recipient of a postgraduate scholarship in esophageal speech at the University of Miami Medical School, attended a summer course in that field at Coral Gables, Florida. In late June, she attended the national convention of laryngectomees at Miami Beach. . . . E. Thayer Curry will attend the annual November meeting of the Louisiana Association of Education at Alexandria; he will speak on "The Place of Hearing Conservation in the Educational Program of the State of Louisiana."

THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH
INDEX TO VOLUME XLI

Abernathy, Elton. Rev.: *Suggestions for Contest Speaking*. Anne Louise Hirt. 86.

Aitken, Hugh G. J., ed. *The Social Sciences in Historical Study*. Rev. by Douglas Ehninger. 75.

Albright, H. D., William P. Halstead, and Lee Mitchell. *Principles of Theatre Art*. Rev. by Hubert Heffner. 426.

Albright, Robert W. Rev.: *An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics*. H. A. Gleason, Jr. 423.

——— Rev.: *Strange Stories of Words*. George F. Schott. 84.

——— Rev.: *The Words We Use*. J. A. Sheard. 83.

——— Rev.: *Workshop in Descriptive Linguistics*. H. A. Gleason, Jr. 423.

Allen, Harold B. Rev.: *The Teaching of Modern Languages*. Secretariat of UNESCO. 421.

Allen, William H. Rev.: *Audio-Visual Methods in Teaching*. Edgar Dale. 90.

Angell, Clarence S. Rev.: *Great Voices of the Reformation*. Harry Emerson Fosdick. 307.

Angier, Florence E. and Wallace B. Conant. *The Anglo-American Phonetic Alphabet*. Rev. by R. S. Brubaker. 195.

Arnold, Carroll C. Rev.: *Judge Medina Speaks*, ed. Maxine Boord Virtue. 75.

Auer, J. Jeffery and Henry Lee Ewbank. *Handbook for Discussion Leaders*. Rev. by Victor M. Powell. 201.

——— Rev.: *Lincoln and Prevention of War*. Ralph G. Lindstrom. 85.

Bailey, Howard. *The ABC's of Play Producing*. Rev. by Maxine R. White. 324.

Baird, A. Craig. What is Speech? A Symposium. 145.

Barnes, Milan D. Rev.: *Staging TV Programs and Commercials*. Robert J. Wade. 206.

Barondess, Benjamin. *Three Lincoln Masterpieces*. Rev. by H. F. Harding. 327.

Baskerville, Barnet. Rev.: *American Demagogues: Twentieth Century*. Reinhard H. Luthin. 179.

——— Rev.: *McCarthy and the Communists*. James Rorty and Moshe Decter. 73.

Baxter, Batsell Barrett. *Speaking for the Master*. Rev. by Charles A. McGlon. 435.

Baylen, Joseph O. John Bright as Speaker and Student of Speaking. 159.

Beaven, Winton. Rev.: *Inside Lincoln's Cabinet: The Civil War Diaries of Salmon P. Chase*, ed. David Donald. 70.

Bellman, Willard. Rev.: *A Syllabus of Stage Lighting*. Stanley McCandless. 88.

——— Rev.: *Techniques of Television Production*. Rudy Bretz. 199.

——— Rev.: *Theatrical Lighting Practice*. Joel Rubin and Lee Watson. 324.

Bentley, Eric. *The Dramatic Event*. Rev. by E. J. West. 319.

Bernard, Rosemary. Rev.: *The Child's Book of Speech Sounds*. Sylvia Chipman. 201.

Berk, Barbara. *The First Book of Stage Costume and Make-Up*. Rev. by Carrie Rasmussen. 88.

Black, John W. and G. C. Tolhurst. The Relative Intelligibility of Language Groups. 57.

——— and Wilbur E. Moore. *Speech: Code, Meaning, and Communication*. Rev. by J. Calvin Callaghan. 430.

Boase, Paul H. Rev.: *Hoof Beats to Heaven: A True Chronicle of the Life and Wild Times of Peter Cartwright, Circuit Rider*. Sidney Greenbie and Marjorie Barstow Greenbie. 416.

——— Rev.: *The Social Ideas of the Northern Evangelists, 1826-1860*. Charles C. Cole, Jr. 69.

Boomsliter, Paul C. Rev.: *On Aphasia*. Sigmund Freud. 81.

——— Rev.: *The Voice of Neurosis*. Paul J. Moses. 195.

Bordeaux, Jean and Mary C. Longerich. *Aphasia Therapeutics*. Rev. by Ruth Beckey Irwin. 80.

Bos, William H. Rev.: *Preaching the Word with Authority*. Frederick W. Schroeder. 433.

——— Rev.: *Speaking in the Church*. John Edward Lantz. 433.

Bowers, Claude G. *Making Democracy a Reality: Jefferson, Jackson and Polk*. Rev. by Dallas C. Dickey. 417.

Boyer, Martha. Rev.: *This is Educational Television*. William Kenneth Cumming. 315.

Braden, Waldo W. Rev.: In Defense of Freedom. 297.

——— and Earnest S. Brandenberg. *Oral Decision-Making*. Rev. by Harold P. Zelko. 192.

Bradley, Morton C., Jr., designer. *The New Testament: The King James Version in Cadenced Form*. Rev. by E. Winston Jones. 200.

Brandenburg, Earnest S. and Waldo W. Braden. *Oral Decision-Making*. Rev. by Harold P. Zelko. 192.

——— Rev.: *Listening and Speaking*. Ralph G. Nichols and Thomas R. Lewis. 76.

Brazie, Gladys. *Speech Practice Book for Speech Improvement and Speech Correction*. Rev. by Ruth B. Manser. 88.

Bretz, Rudy. *Techniques of Television Production*. Rev. by Willard Bellman. 199.

Brigance, William Norwood. What is Speech? A Symposium. 147.

——— and Wilhelmina G. Hedde. *American Speech*. Rev. by Victor M. Powell. 327.

——— *Speech Communication*. Rev. by Victor Powell. 327.

Brockriede, Wayne E. Bentham's Criticism of Rhetoric and Rhetoricians. 377.

Brown, Charles T. *Introduction to Speech*. Rev. by Theodore G. Ehrsam. 310.

Brubaker, R. S. Rev.: *The Anglo-American Phonetic Alphabet*. Florence E. Angier and Wallace B. Conant. 195.

——— Rev.: *The Phonetic Alphabet*. Frances A. Cartier. 195.

Burklund, Carl E. The Presentation of Figurative Language. 383.

Bywater, Ingram and W. Rhys Roberts, transs. *Aristotle's Rhetoric and Poetics*. Rev. by Ray Nadeau. 326.

Callaghan, J. Calvin. Rev.: *Speech: Code, Meaning, and Communication.* John W. Black and Wilbur E. Moore. 430.
Caplan, Harry. [*Cicero*] *Ad C. Herennium de Ratione Dicendi (Rhetorica ad Herennium) With an English Translation.* Rev. by Wilbur S. Howell. 413.
——— Rev.: *Demosthenes' Orations,* ed. John Warrington. 69.
Cardwell, Guy A. Rev.: *The South in American Literature: 1607-1900.* Jay B. Hubbell. 182.
Cartier, Frances A. *The Phonetic Alphabet.* Rev. by R. S. Brubaker. 195.
Cartwright, Dorwin, Daniel Katz, Samuel Eldersveld and Alfred McClung Lee, eds. *Public Opinion and Propaganda: A Book of Readings.* Rev. by Robert T. Oliver. 81.
Chapman, John, ed. *Theatre '54.* Rev. by Elizabeth G. Scanlan. 320.
Chipman, Sylvia. *The Child's Book of Speech Sounds.* Rev. by Rosemary Bernard. 201.
Clark, Robert D. Rev.: *Adventure in Politics: We go to the Legislature.* Richard L. Neuberger. 180.
Clarke, M. L. *Rhetoric at Rome: A Historical Survey.* Rev. by Kenneth W. Pauli. 202
Clifford, James L. *Young Sam Johnson.* Rev. by Donald J. Winslow. 305.
Cole, Charles C., Jr. *The Social Ideas of the Northern Evangelists, 1826-1860.* Rev. by Paul H. Boase. 69.
Conant, Wallace B. and Florence E. Angier. *The Anglo-American Phonetic Alphabet.* Rev. by R. S. Brubaker. 195.
Condee, Ralph W., Frederick L. Gwynn, and Arthur O. Lewis, Jr. *The Case For Poetry.* Rev. by Lionel Crocker. 85.
Cooper, Charles W. *Preface to Drama: An Introduction to Dramatic Literature and Theatre Art.* Rev. by Reginald V. Holland. 323.
Corwin, Blanche A., ed. *The Theatre Annual, 1954.* Rev. by Herbert L. Smith. 87.
Cowgill, Rome, Walter E. Kingson, and Ralph Levy. *Broadcasting Radio and Television.* Rev. by Robert L. Snyder. 314.
Crocker, Lionel. Rev.: *The Case For Poetry.* Frederick L. Gwyn, Ralph W. Condee, and Arthur O. Lewis, Jr. 85.
Croft, Albert J. Rev.: *Guide to Good Speech.* James H. McBurney and Ernest J. Wrage. 431.
Cromwell, Harvey. The Persistency of the Effect of Argumentative Speeches. 154.
Crowell, Laura. Speech in the Building of a Modern State. 118.
Cumming, William Kenneth. *This is Educational Television.* Rev. by Martha Boyer. 315.
Current, Richard N. *Daniel Webster and the Rise of National Conservatism.* Rev. by Leland M. Griffin. 302.
Curtius, Ernst. *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages.* Rev. by James J. Murphy. 77.
Curvin, Jonathan W. Views on the Army-McCarthy Hearings. 2.
——— Rev.: *The Theatre in Our Times.* John Gassner. 183.
Dale, Edgar. *Audio-Visual Methods in Teaching.* Rev. by William H. Allen. 90.
Dana, Richard Henry, Jr. *An Autobiographical Sketch.* Rev. by Leland M. Griffin. 85.
Danielsson, Bror. *John Hart's Works on English Orthography and Pronunciation.* Rev. by Lee S. Hultzén. 419.
Davidson, Henry A. *Handbook of Parliamentary Procedure.* Rev. by Joseph F. O'Brien. 431.
Decter, Moshe and James Rorty. *McCarthy and the Communists.* Rev. by Barnet Baskerville. 73.
Department of Records and Research, Tuskegee Institute, ed. *The New South and Higher Education.* Rev. by Willis N. Pitts, Jr. 89.
Dickens, Milton. *Speech: Dynamic Communication.* Rev. by Harold F. Harding. 193.
Dickey, Dallas C. Rev.: *Making Democracy A Reality: Jefferson, Jackson and Polk.* Claude G. Bowers. 417.
Donald, David, ed. *Inside Lincoln's Cabinet: The Civil War Diaries of Salmon P. Chase.* Rev. by Winton Beaven. 70.
Downer, Alan S. Rev.: *America Takes the Stage: Romanticism in American Drama and Theatre, 1790-1900.* Richard Moody. 428.
Dreher, John J. Rev.: *A Dictionary of Linguistics.* Mario A. Pei and Frank Gaynor. 90.
Dressel, Paul L. and Lewis B. Mayhew. *General Education: Explorations in Evaluation.* Rev. by Elbert W. Harrington. 312.
Driver, Helen Irene. *Multiple Counselling.* Rev. by Wesley Wiksell. 90.
Duerr, Edwin. Rev.: *The Actor's Ways and Means.* Michael Redgrave. 190.
Dugan, John T. Rev.: *Renunciation as a Tragic Focus.* Eugene H. Falk. 190.

Ecroyd, Donald H. Rev.: *Discussion and Conference.* William N. Sattler and N. Edd Miller. 310.
Edgell, David P. *William Ellery Channing.* Rev. by Marie Hochmuth. 415.
Ehninger, Douglas. Rev.: *The Social Sciences in Historical Study,* ed. Hugh G. J. Aitken. 75.
Ehrensperger, Harold. Rev.: *George Pierce Baker and the American Theatre.* Wisner Payne Kinne. 184.
Ehrsam, Theodore G. Rev.: *Introduction to Speech.* Charles T. Brown. 310.
Eisenson, Jon. *Examining for Aphasia.* Rev. by James V. Frick. 200.
Eldersveld, Samuel, Daniel Katz, Dorwin Cartwright, and Alfred McClung Lee, eds. *Public Opinion and Propaganda: A Book of Readings.* Rev. by Robert T. Oliver. 81.
Ellingsworth, Huber. John Quincy Adams II and the Regenerate Rebels. 391.
Entwistle, William J. *Aspects of Language.* Rev. by Lee S. Hultzén. 308.
Ewbank, Henry L., Sr. What is Speech? A Symposium. 145.
——— and J. Jeffery Auer. *Handbook for Discussion Leaders.* Rev. by Victor M. Powell. 201.

Falk, Eugene H. *Renunciation as a Tragic Focus.* Rev. by John T. Dugan. 190.
Fosdick, Harry Emerson. *Great Voices of the*

Reformation. Rev. by Clarence S. Angell. 307.
Fowler, Murray. The Forum. Observations on "Communication Primer," A Film. 407.
French, Sidney J., ed. *Accent on Teaching*. Rev. by Elbert W. Harrington. 312.
Freud, Sigmund. *On Aphasia*. Rev. by Paul C. Boomsliter. 81.
Frick, James V. Rev.: *Examining for Aphasia*. Jon Eisenson. 200.
Fussell, Edwin E. *Edward Arlington Robinson: The Literary Background of a Traditional Poet*. Rev. by Robert H. Sproat. 204.

Gagen, Jean Elizabeth. *The New Woman: Her Emergence in English Drama, 1600-1730*. Rev. by Fairfax Proudfit Walkup. 189.
Gassner, John. *Masters of the Drama*. Rev. by E. J. West. 203.
——— *The Theatre in Our Times*. Rev. by Jonathan Curvin. 183.
Gaynor, Frank and Mario A. Pei. *A Dictionary of Linguistics*. Rev. by John J. Dreher. 90.
Geiger, Don. Pluralism in the Interpreter's Search for Sanctions. 43.
Gifford, Frank D., ed. *The Anglican Pulpit Today*. Rev. by Ronald E. Sleeth. 205.
Gilman, Albert. Rev.: *Shakespeare Survey 8*, ed. Allardyce Nicoll. 318.
Gleason, H. A., Jr. *An Introducton to Descriptive Linguistics*. Rev. by Robert W. Albright. 423.
——— *Workbook in Descriptive Linguistics*. Rev. by Robert W. Albright. 423.
Goetzinger, Charles S. Rev.: *Guide to Community Action*. Mark S. Matthews. 313.
Goldschmidt, Walter. Language and Culture: A Reply. 279.
Gondin, William R. and Edward W. Mammen. *The Art of Speaking Made Simple*. Rev. by Roy F. Hudson. 194.
——— Rev.: *Philosophy and Analysis*, ed. Margaret Macdonald. 422.
Greenbie, Sidney and Marjorie Barstow Greenbie. *Hoof Beats to Heaven: A true Chronicle of the Life and Wild Times of Peter Cartwright, Circuit Rider*. Rev. by Paul H. Boase. 416.
Greet, W. Cabell. Rev.: Thoughts on the History of Speech Education in America. 174.
Griffin, Leland M. Rev.: *An Autobiographical Sketch*. Richard Henry Dana, Jr. 85.
——— Rev.: *Daniel Webster and the Rise of National Conservatism*. Richard N. Current. 302.
——— New Books in Review. 64.
——— New Books in Review. 174.
——— New Books in Review. 297.
——— New Books in Review. 409.
Grogan, John M., David C. Phillips and Earl H. Ryan. *An Introduction to Radio and Television*. Rev. by Harold E. Nelson. 314.
Gross, Ben. *I Looked and I Listened*. Rev. by John P. Highlander. 197.
Gulley, Halbert E. Rev.: Winston Churchill: In Crisis, Eloquence. 64.
——— *Essentials of Discussion and Debate*. Rev. by Ronald F. Reid. 311.
Gunderson, Robert G., Rev.: *Stormy Ben Butler*. Robert S. Holzman. 71.
——— Rev.: *William Lloyd Garrison and the Humanitarian Reformers*. Russell B. Nye. 417.
Gwynn, Frederick L., Ralph W. Condee, and Arthur O. Lewis, Jr. *The Case for Poetry*. Rev. by Lionel Crocker. 85.

Haberman, Frederick W. Views on the Army-McCarthy Hearings. 1.
——— Rev.: *William Freeman Vilas: Doctrinaire Democrat*. Horace Samuel Merrill. 71.
Haiman, Franklyn S. A Measurement of Authoritarian Attitudes Toward Discussion Leadership. 140.
——— Rev.: *The American Concept of Leadership*. Colonel Sherman L. Kiser. 82.
Halstead, William P., H. D. Albright, and Lee Mitchell. *Principles of Theatre Art*. Rev. by Hubert Heffner. 426.
Harding, Harold F. Rev.: On Good Writing. 409.
——— Rev.: *Men, Motives, and Money*. Albert Lauterbach. 328.
——— Rev.: *Speech: Dynamic Communication*. Milton Dickens. 193.
——— *Three Lincoln Masterpieces*. Benjamin Barondess. 327.
Harrington, Elbert W. The Role of Speech in Liberal Education. 219.
——— Rev.: *Accent on Teaching*, ed. Sidney J. French. 312.
Harwood, Kenneth. Rev.: *The Process and Effects of Mass Communication*, ed. Wilbur Schramm. 205.
Haugen, Einar. The Living Ibsen. 19.
Hayakawa, S. I., ed. *Language, Meaning and Maturity*. Rev. by Harry L. Weinberg. 424.
Hedde, Wilhelmina G. and William Norwood Brigance. *American Speech*. Rev. by Victor M. Powell. 327.
Hefferline, Ralph Franklin. Communication Theory: I. Integrator of the Arts and Sciences. 223.
——— Communication Theory: II. Extension to Intrapersonal Behavior. 365.
Heffner, Hubert. Rev.: *Principles of Theatre Art*. H. D. Albright, William P. Halstead, and Lee Mitchell. 426.
Henderlider, Clair R. and Eugene E. White. *Practical Public Speaking*. Rev. by John P. Highlander. 76.
Henneke, Ben Graf. *Reading Aloud Effectively*. Rev. by John Robson. 193.
Herndon, Booton. *Praised and Damned: The Story of Fulton Lewis, Jr*. Rev. by John P. Highlander. 199.
Herrick, Marvin T. The Teacher as Reader and Interpreter of Literature. 110.
——— *Tragicomedy*. Rev. by Albert E. Johnson. 427.
Highlander, John P., Rev.: *I Looked and I Listened*. Ben Gross. 197.
——— Rev.: *Practical Public Speaking*. Eugene E. White and Clair R. Henderlider. 76.
——— Rev.: *Praised and Damned: The Story of Fulton Lewis, Jr*. Booton Herndon. 199.
Hill, Archibald A. Linguistics Since Bloomfield. 253.
Hirt, Anne Louise. *Suggestions for Contest Speaking*. Rev. by Elton Abernathy. 86.
Hitchcock, Orville A. Views on the Army-McCarthy Hearings. 11.

Hochmuth, Marie. Rev.: *William Ellery Channing*. David P. Edgell. 415.
Hodge, Francis. Rev.: *The Lion of the West*. James Kirke Paulding. 322.
Hoffman, Calvin. *The Murder of the Man Who Was 'Shakespeare.'* Rev. by Ray Irwin. 316.
Holland, L. Virginia. Kenneth Burke's Dramatistic Approach in Speech Criticism. 352.
Holland, Reginald V. Rev.: *Preface to Drama: An Introduction to Dramatistic Literature and Theatre Art*. Charles W. Cooper. 323.
Holzman, Robert S. *Stormy Ben Butler*. Rev. by Robert G. Gunderson. 71.
Hoover, Herbert. *Addresses Upon the American Road, 1950-1955*. Rev. by Hollis L. White. 326.
Hotson, Leslie. *The First Night of Twelfth Night*. Rev. by Richard Moody. 318.
Howell, Wilbur Samuel. The Forum. Irving J. Lee. 284.
——— The Forum. The *QJS* and *SM:* A Problem in Boundaries. 61.
——— Rev.: [*Cicero*] *Ad C. Herennium de Ratione Dicendi (Rhetorica ad Herennium) With an English Translation*. Harry Caplan. 413.
——— Rev.: *The Garden of Eloquence*. Henry Peacham. 67.
——— Rev.: *Twelve Americans Speak*, ed. John E. Pomfret. 179.
Howell, William S., Donald K. Smith, and David W. Thompson. *Speech, Debate, Drama in Contests and Festivals*. Rev. by A. L. Thurman, Jr. 310.
——— Rev.: *Studies in Motivation*, ed. David C. McClelland. 309.
Hubbell, Jay B. *The South in American Literature: 1607-1900*. Rev. by Guy A. Cardwell. 182.
Hudson, Lynton A. *Life and the Theatre*. Rev. by Russell W. Lembke. 183.
Hudson, Roy F. Rev.: *Speech Project and Drill Book*, Le Roy T. Laase. 328.
——— Rev.: *The Art of Speaking Made Simple*. William R. Gondin and Edward W. Mammen. 194.
Hultzén, Lee S. The Useful Study of Phonetics. 105.
——— Rev.: *Aspects of Language*. William J. Entwistle. 308.
——— Rev.: *John Hart's Works on English Orthography and Pronunciation*. Bror Danielsson. 419.
Hunt, Everett. Rhetoric as a Humane Study. 114.
Hunter, Edwin R. *Shakspere and Common Sense*. Rev. by Ray Irwin. 317.

Irwin, Ray. Rev.: *The Murder of the Man Who Was 'Shakespeare.'* Calvin Hoffman. 316.
——— Rev.: *Shakspere and Common Sense*. Edwin R. Hunter. 317.
Irwin, Ruth Beckey. Rev.: *Aphasia Therapeutics*. Mary C. Longerich and Jean Bordeaux. 80.
Ives, Sumner. Use of Field Materials in the Determination of Dialect Groupings. 359.

Jeffrey, Robert C. Rev.: *Hugh Roy Cullen*. Ed Kilman and Theon Wright. 202.
Johnson, Albert E. Rev.: *The Critics in the Audience of the London Theatres from Buckingham to Sheridan*. Dane Farnsworth Smith. 187.
——— Rev.: *The Theatrical Public in the Time of Garrick*. Harry William Pedicord. 187.
——— Rev.: *Tragicomedy*. Marvin T. Herrick. 427.
Johnson, Walter. *How We Drafted Adlai Stevenson*. Rev. by Richard Murphy. 303
Jones, E. Winston. Rev.: *The New Testament: The King James Version in Cadenced Form*, designer Morton C. Bradley, Jr. 200.
——— Rev.: *Pastoral Preaching*. David A. MacLennan. 435.
——— Rev.: *The Psalms in Rhythmic Prose*, transs. James A. Kleist and Thomas J. Lynam. 200.
——— Rev.: *Who Speaks for God?* Gerald Kennedy. 435.

Katz, Daniel, Dorwin Cartwright, Samuel Eldersveld, and Alfred McClung Lee, eds. *Public Opinion and Propaganda: A Book of Readings*. Rev. by Robert T. Oliver. 81.
Keltner, John. Rev.: *Group Relations at the Crossroads*, ed. Muzafer Sherif and M. O. Wilson. 196.
Kennedy, Gerald. *Who Speaks for God?* Rev. by E. Winston Jones. 435.
Kilman, Ed and Theon Wright. *Hugh Roy Cullen*. Rev. by Robert C. Jeffrey. 202.
Kingson, Walter E., Rome Cowgill, and Ralph Levy. *Broadcasting Radio and Television*. Rev. by Robert L. Snyder. 314.
Kinne, Wisner Payne. *George Pierce Baker and the American Theatre*. Rev. by Harold Ehrensperger. 184.
Kiser, Sherman L., Colonel. *The American Concept of Leadership*. Rev. by Franklyn S. Haiman. 82.
Kleist, James A. and Thomas J. Lynam, transs. *The Psalms in Rhythmic Prose*. Rev. by E. Winston Jones. 200.
Koch, Albert Winfield. Rev.: *Four Steps to Better Hearing*. W. Richard Miles. 80.
Kolb, Gwin J. and James H. Sledd. *Dr. Johnson's Dictionary*. Rev. by Donald J. Winslow. 305.
Kramer, Magdalene. The Forum. What is New in the Speech Association of America? 403.

Laase, Le Roy T. *Speech Project and Drill Book*. Rev. by Roy F. Hudson. 328.
LaFollette, Fola and Belle Case. *Robert M. LaFollette*. Rev. by Carroll P. Lahman. 418.
Lahman, Carroll P. Rev.: *Robert M. LaFollette*. Fola and Belle Case LaFollette. 418.
Lang, Robert A. Rev.: *Clear Channels: Television and the American People*. Max Wylie. 316.
Lantz, John Edward. *Speaking in the Church*. Rev. by William H. Bos. 433.
Lauterbach, Albert. *Men, Motives and Money*. Rev. by H. F. Harding. 328.
Lee, Alfred McClung, Daniel Katz, Dorwin Cartwright, and Samuel Eldersveld, eds. *Public Opinion and Propaganda: A Book of Readings*. Rev. by Robert T. Oliver. 81.

Sledd, James H. and Gwin J. Kolb. *Dr. Johnson's Dictionary*. Rev. by Donald J. Winslow. 305.
Sleeth, Ronald E. Rev.: *The Anglican Pulpit Today*, ed. Frank D. Gifford. 205.
Smith, Charles Daniel. Rev.: *Gladstone: A Biography*. Sir Philip Magnus. 306.
——— Rev.: *How to Talk Your Way to Success*. Harry Simmons. 85.
Smith, Dane Farnsworth. *The Critics in the Audience of the London Theatres from Buckingham to Sheridan*. Rev. by Albert E. Johnson. 187.
Smith, Donald K., William S. Howell, and David W. Thompson. *Speech, Debate, Drama in Contests and Festivals*. Rev. by A. L. Thurman, Jr. 310.
Smith, Herbert L. Rev.: *The Theatre Annual, 1954*, ed. Blanche A. Corwin. 87.
Smith, Joseph F. Rev.: *A Mouse in the Corner*. Dorothy Will Simon. 434.
Snyder, Robert L. Rev.: *Broadcasting Radio and Television*. Walter E. Kingson, Rome Cowgill, and Ralph Levy. 314.
Sondel, Bess Rev.: *Woman's Labor Leader*. Agnes Nestor. 72.
Speaight, Robert. *William Poel and the Elizabethan Revival*. Rev. by Pat M. Ryan, Jr. 429.
Sphangos, Mary Tom and Samuel Selden. *Frederick Henry Koch: Pioneer Playmaker*. Rev. by W. David Sievers. 321.
Sproat, Robert H. Rev.: *Edward Arlington Robinson: The Literary Background of a Traditional Poet*. Edwin S. Fussell. 204.
——— Rev.: *The Modern Irish Writers*. Estella Ruth Taylor. 204.
Stanton, Alfred H. and Morris S. Schwartz. *The Mental Hospital*. Rev. by Elwood Murray. 205.
Starr, Chester G. *Civilization and the Caesars: The Intellectual Revolution in the Roman Empire*. Rev. by James J. Murphy. 181.
Stevenson, Adlai E. *Call to Greatness*. Rev. by Richard Murphy. 303.

Taylor, Estella Ruth. *The Modern Irish Writers*. Rev. by Robert H. Sproat. 204.
Thompson, David W., William S. Howell, and Donald K. Smith. *Speech, Debate, Drama in Contests and Festivals*. Rev. by A. L. Thurman, Jr. 310.
Thurman, A. L., Jr. Rev.: *Speech, Debate, Drama in Contests and Festivals*. William S. Howell, Donald K. Smith, and David W. Thompson. 310.
Toki, Zemaro. *Japanese Nō Plays*. Rev. by Betty McGee Vetter. 87.
Tolhurst, G. C. and Black, John W. The Relative Intelligibility of Language Groups. 57.

Untersteiner, Mario. *The Sophists*. Rev. by Otis M. Walter. 325.

Vetter, Betty McGee. Rev.: *Japanese Nō Plays*. Zemaro Toki. 87.
Virtue, Maxine Boord, ed. *Judge Medina Speaks*. Rev. by Carroll C. Arnold. 75.

Wade, Robert J. *Staging TV Programs and Commercials*. Rev. by Milan D. Barnes. 206.
Walkup, Fairfax Proudfit. Rev.: *The New Woman: Her Emergence in English Drama, 1600-1730*. Jean Elizabeth Gagen. 189.
Wallace, Karl R., ed. *History of Speech Education in America*. Rev. by W. Cabell Greet. 174.
——— The Forum. Presentation of the Speech Education Volume. 62.
Walter, J. H., ed. *King Henry V*. Rev. by E. J. West. 186.
Walter, Otis M. Toward an Analysis of Motivation. 271.
——— Rev.: *The Sophists*. Mario Untersteiner. 325.
Warrington, John, ed. *Demosthenes' Orations*. Rev. by Harry Caplan. 69.
Watson, Lee and Joel Rubin. *Theatrical Lighting Practice*. Rev. by Willard Bellman. 324.
Weaver, Andrew T. What is Speech? A Symposium. 151.
Weinberg, Harry L. Rev.: *Language, Meaning and Maturity*, ed. S. I. Hayakawa. 424.
West, E. J. Rev.: *Antony and Cleopatra*, ed. M. R. Ridley. 186.
——— Rev.: *The Dramatic Event*. Eric Bentley. 319.
——— Rev.: *King Henry V*, ed. J. H. Walter. 186.
——— Rev.: *Masters of the Drama*. John Gassner. 203.
——— Rev.: *Shakespeare: Of an Age and for All Time*, ed. Charles Tyler Prouty. 87.
Wham, Benjamin. Views on the Army-McCarthy Hearings. 5.
White, Eugene E. and Clair R. Henderlider. *Practical Public Speaking*. Rev. by John P. Highlander. 76.
White, Hollis L. Rev.: *Addresses Upon the American Road, 1950-1955*. Herbert Hoover. 326.
——— Rev.: *The President's Words: Volume I, Eisenhower*. Elsie De Graff Shoemaker and Ralph J. Shoemaker. 327.
White, Melvin R. Rev.: *The ABC's of Play Producing*. Howard Bailey. 324.
Whiting, Frank M. *An Introduction to the Theatre*. Rev. by Richard Moody. 79.
Wiksell, Wesley. Rev.: *Multiple Counselling*. Helen Irene Driver. 90.
Williams, Donald E. *Group Discussion and Argumentation in Legal Education*. 397.
Williams, Emlyn. *Readings From Dickens*. Rev. by Theresa and Richard Murphy. 78.
Willis, Edgar E. Research in Radio and Television by Graduate Students in Speech. 261.
Wilson, Garff B. What is Style in Acting? 127.
Wilson, M. O. and Muzafer Sherif, eds. *Group Relations at the Crossroads*. Rev. by John Keltner. 196.
Winslow, Donald J. Rev.: *Dr. Johnson's Dictionary*. James H. Sledd and Gwin J. Kolb. 305.
——— Rev.: *Young Sam Johnson*. James L. Clifford. 305.
Wolff, Harold G. and Leo W. Simmons. *Social Science in Medicine*. Rev. by Elwood Murray. 83.

Wrage, Ernest J. and James H. McBurney. *Guide to Good Speech.* Rev. by Albert J. Croft. 431.
——— Rev.: *Yankee Reformers in the Urban Age.* Arthur Mann. 301.
Wright, Theon and Ed Kilman. *Hugh Roy Cullen.* Rev. by Robert C. Jeffrey. 202.
Wylie, Max. *Clear Channels: Television and the American People.* Rev. by Robert A. Lang. 316.

Zelko, Harold P. Is Oratory a Lost Art? 38.
——— Rev.: *Oral Decision-Making.* Waldo W. Braden and Earnest S. Brandenburg. 192.

ARTICLES

Bentham's Criticism of Rhetoric and Rhetoricians. Wayne E. Brockriede. 377.
Communication Theory: I. Integrator of the Arts and Sciences. Ralph Franklin Hefferline. 223.
Communication Theory: II. Extension to Intrapersonal Behavior. Ralph Franklin Hefferline. p. 365.
Dennis Kearney: Case Study in Demagoguery. Charles W. Lomas. 234.
First Organized Revolt Against the Theatrical Syndicate, The. Monroe Lippman. 343.
Group Discussion and Argumentation in Legal Education. Donald E. Williams. 307.
Interpretation in the Dickens Period. Theresa Murphy. 243.
Is Oratory a Lost Art? Harold P. Zelko. 38.
John Bright as Speaker and Student of Speaking. Joseph O. Bavlen. 159.
John Quincy Adams II and the Regenerate Rebels. Huber Ellingsworth. 391.
Kenneth Burke's Dramatistic Approach in Speech Criticism. L. Virginia Holland. 352.
Language and Culture: A Reply. Walter Goldschmidt. 279.
Limits of Rhetoric, The. Maurice Natanson. 133.
Linguistics Since Bloomfield. Archibald A. Hill. 253.
Living Ibsen, The. Einar Haugen. 19.
Measurement of Authoritarian Attitudes Toward Discussion Leadership, A. Franklyn S. Haiman. 140.
Persistency of the Effect of Argumentative Speeches, The. Harvey Cromwell. 154.
Pluralism in the Interpreter's Search for Sanctions. Don Geiger. 43.
Presentation of Figurative Language, The. Carl E. Burklund. 383.
Pro-Northern Movement in England, 1861-1865, The. E. James Lennon. 27.
Relative Intelligibility of Language Groups, The. John W. Black and G. C. Tolhurst. 57.
Research in Radio and Television by Graduate Students in Speech. Edgar E. Willis. 261.
Responsibilities of the Theatre Director. Lee Norvelle. 250.
Rhetoric as a Humane Study. Everett Hunt. 114.
Role of Speech in Liberal Education, The. Elbert W. Harrington. 219.
Speech in the Building of a Modern State. Laura Crowell. 118.
Teacher as Reader and Interpreter of Literature, The. Marvin T. Herrick. 110.
Toward an Analysis of Motivation. Otis M. Walter. 271.
Use of Field Materials in the Determination of Dialect Groupings. Sumner Ives. 359.
Useful Study of Phonetics, The. Lee S. Hultzén. 105.
Views on the Army-McCarthy Hearings. Frederick W. Haberman with the assistance of Jonathan W. Curvin, Benjamin Wham, Ordean G. Ness, Orville A. Hitchcock, and Ben Park. 1.
What is Speech? A Symposium. Henry L. Ewbank, Sr., A. Craig Baird, W. Norwood Brigance, Wayland M. Parish, and Andrew T. Weaver. 145.
What is Style in Acting? Garff B. Wilson. 127.

NEW BOOKS IN REVIEW

ABC's of Play Producing, The. Howard Bailey. Rev. by Melvin R. White. 324.
Accent on Teaching. Sidney J. French, ed. Rev. by Elbert W. Harrington. 312.
Actor's Ways and Means, The. Michael Redgrave. Rev. by Edwin Duerr. 190.
Addresses Upon the American Road, 1950-1955. Herbert Hoover. Rev. by Hollis L. White. 326.
Adventures in Politics: We go to the Legislature. Richard L. Neuberger. Rev. by Robert D. Clark. 180.
America Takes the Stage: Romanticism in American Drama and Theatre, 1750-1900. Richard Moody. Rev. by Alan S. Downer. 428.
American Concept of Leadership, The. Colonel Sherman L. Kiser. Rev. by Franklyn S. Haiman. 82.
American Demagogues: Twentieth Century. Reinhard H. Luthin. Rev. by Barnet Baskerville. 179.
American Speech. Wilhelmina G. Hedde and William Norwood Brigance. Rev. by Victor M. Powell. 327.
Anglican Pulpit Today, The. Frank D. Gifford, ed. Rev. by Ronald E. Sleeth. 205.
Anglo-American Phonetic Alphabet, The. Florence E. Angier and Wallace B. Conant. Rev. by R. S. Brubaker. 195.
Antony and Cleopatra. M. R. Ridley, ed. Rev. by E. J. West. 186.
Aphasia Therapeutics. Mary C. Longerich and Jean Bordeaux. Rev. by Ruth Beckey Irwin. 80.
Aristotle's Rhetoric and Poetics. W. Rhys Roberts and Ingram Bywater, transs. Rev. by Ray Nadeau. 326.
Art of Speaking Made Simple, The. William R. Gondin and Edward W. Mammen. Rev. by Roy F. Hudson. 194.
Aspects of Language. William J. Entwistle. Rev. by Lee S. Hultzén. 308.
Audio-Visual Methods in Teaching. Edgar Dale. Rev. by William H. Allen. 90.
Autobiographical Sketch, An. Richard Henry Dana, Jr. Rev. by Leland M. Griffin. 85.
Broadcasting Radio and Television. Walter E. Kingson, Rome Cowgill, and Ralph Levy. Rev. by Robert L. Snyder. 314.

Call to Greatness. Adlai E. Stevenson. Rev. by Richard Murphy. 303.
Case for Poetry, The. Frederick L. Gwynn, Ralph W. Condee, and Arthur O. Lewis, Jr. Rev. by Lionel Crocker. 85.
Child's Book of Speech Sounds, The. Sylvia Chipman. Rev. by Rosemary Bernard. 201.
[Cicero] *Ad C. Herennium de Ratione Dicendi (Rhetorica ad Herennium) With an English Translation.* Harry Caplan. Rev. by Wilbur S. Howell. 413.
Civilization and the Caesars: The Intellectual Revolution in the Roman Empire. Chester G. Starr. Rev. by James J. Murphy. 181.
Clear Channels: Television and the American People. Max Wylie. Rev. by Robert A. Lang. 316.
Critics in the Audience of the London Theatres from Buckingham to Sheridan, The. Dane Farnsworth Smith. Rev. by Albert E. Johnson. 187.
Daniel Webster and the Rise of National Conservatism. Richard N. Current. Rev. by Leland M. Griffin. 302.
Demosthenes' Orations. John Warrington, ed. Rev. by Harry Caplan. 69.
Dictionary of Linguistics, A. Mario A. Pei and Frank Gaynor. Rev. by John J. Dreher. 90.
Discussion and Conference. William N. Sattler and N. Edd Miller. Rev. by Donald H. Ecroyd. 310.
Dr. Johnson's Dictionary. James H. Sledd and Gwin J. Kolb. Rev. by Donald J. Winslow. 305.
Dramatic Event, The. Eric Bentley. Rev. by E. J. West. 319.
Edward Arlington Robinson: The Literary Background of a Traditional Poet. Edwin S. Fussell. Rev. by Robert H. Sproat. 204.
Essentials of Discussion and Debate. Halbert E. Gulley. Rev. by Ronald F. Reid. 311.
European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages. Ernst Curtius. Rev. by James J. Murphy. 77.
Every Little Movement. Ted Shawn. Rev. by Claude L. Shaver. 191.
Examining for Aphasia. Jon Eisenson. Rev. by James V. Frick. 200.
First Book of Stage Costume and Make-Up, The. Barbara Berk. Rev. by Carrie Rasmussen. 88.
First Night of Twelfth Night, The. Leslie Hotson. Rev. by Richard Moody. 318.
Four Steps to Better Hearing. W. Richard Miles. Rev. by Albert Winfield Koch. 89.
Frederick Henry Koch: Pioneer Playmaker. Samuel Selden and Mary Tom Sphangos. Rev. by W. David Sievers. 321.
Garden of Eloquence, The. Henry Peacham. Rev. by Wilbur Samuel Howell. 67.
General Education: Explorations in Evaluation. Paul L. Dressel and Lewis B. Mayhew. Rev. by Elbert W. Harrington. 312.
George Pierce Baker and the American Theatre. Wisner Payne Kinne. Rev. by Harold Ehrensperger. 184.
Gladstone: A Biography. Sir Philip Magnus. Rev. by Charles Daniel Smith. 306.
Great Voices of the Reformation. Harry Emerson Fosdick. Rev. by Clarence S. Angell. 307.
Group Relations at the Crossroads. Muzafer Sherif and M. O. Wilson, eds. Rev. by John Keltner. 196.
Guide to Community Action. Mark S. Matthews. Rev. by Charles S. Goetzinger. 313.
Guide to Good Speech. James H. McBurney and Ernest J. Wrage. Rev. by Albert J. Croft. 431.
Handbook for Discussion Leaders. J. Jeffery Auer and Henry Lee Ewbank. Rev. by Victor M. Powell. 201.
Handbook of Parliamentary Procedure. Henry A. Davidson. Rev. by Joseph F. O'Brien. 431.
History of Speech Education in America. Karl R. Wallace, ed. Rev. by W. Cabell Greet. 174.
Hoof Beats to Heaven: A true Chronicle of the Life and Wild Times of Peter Cartwright, Circuit Rider. Sidney Greenbie and Marjorie Barstow Greenbie. Rev. by Paul H. Boase. 416.
How to Talk Your Way to Success. Harry Simmons. Rev. by Charles Daniel Smith. 85.
How We Drafted Adlai Stevenson. Walter Johnson. Rev. by Richard Murphy. 303.
Hugh Roy Cullen. Ed Kilman and Theon Wright. Rev. by Robert C. Jeffrey. 202.
I Looked and I Listened. Ben Gross. Rev. by John P. Highlander. 197.
Inside Lincoln's Cabinet: The Civil War Diaries of Salmon P. Chase. David Donald, ed. Rev. by Winton Beaven. 70.
Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics, An. H. A. Gleason, Jr. Rev. by Robert W. Albright. 423.
Introduction to Radio and Television, An. David C. Phillips, John M. Grogan and Earl H. Ryan. Rev. by Harold E. Nelson. 314.
Introduction to Speech. Charles T. Brown. Rev. by Theodore G. Ehrsam. 310.
Introduction to the Theatre, An. Frank M. Whiting. Rev. by Richard Moody. 79.
Japanese Nō Plays. Zemaro Toki. Rev. by Betty McGee Vetter. 87.
John Hart's Works on English Orthography and Pronunciation. Bror Danielsson. Rev. by Lee S. Hultzén. 419.
Judge Medina Speaks. Maxine Boord Virtue, ed. Rev. by Carroll C. Arnold. 75.
King Henry V. J. H. Walter, ed. Rev. by E. J. West. 186.
Language, Meaning and Maturity. S. I. Hayakawa, ed. Rev. by Harry L. Weinberg. 424.
Life and the Theatre. Lynton A. Hudson. Rev. by Russell W. Lembke. 183.
Lincoln and Prevention of War. Ralph G. Lindstrom. Rev. by J. Jeffery Auer. 85.
Lion of the West, The. James Kirke Paulding. Rev. by Francis Hodge. 322.
Listening and Speaking. Ralph G. Nichols and Thomas R. Lewis. Rev. by Earnest Brandenburg. 76.
Making Democracy A Reality: Jefferson, Jackson and Polk. Claude G. Bowers. Rev. by Dallas C. Dickey. 417.
Masters of the Drama. John Gassner. Rev. by E. J. West. 203.
McCarthy and the Communists. James Rorty

and Moshe Decter. Rev. by Barnet Baskerville. 73.
Men, Motives, and Money. Albert Lauterbach. Rev. by H. F. Harding. 328.
Mental Hospital, The. Alfred H. Stanton and Morris S. Schwartz. Rev. by Elwood Murray. 205.
Miniature Plays. Madge Miller. Rev. by Carrie Rasmussen. 88.
Modern Irish Writers, The. Estella Ruth Taylor. Rev. by Robert H. Sproat. 204.
Motivation and Personality. A. H. Maslow. Rev. by Elwood Murray. 197.
Mouse in the Corner, A. Dorothy Will Simon. Rev. by Joseph F. Smith. 434.
Multiple Counselling. Helen Irene Driver. Rev. by Wesley Wiksell. 90.
Murder of the Man Who Was 'Shakespeare', The. Calvin Hoffman. Rev. by Ray Irwin. 316.
New South and Higher Education, The. Department of Records and Research, Tuskegee Institute, ed. Rev. by Willis N. Pitts, Jr. 89.
New Testament, The: The King James Version in Cadenced Form. Morton C. Bradley, Jr., designer. Rev. by F. Winston Jones. 200.
New Woman, The: Her Emergence in English Drama, 1600-1730. Jean Elizabeth Gagen. Rev. by Fairfax Proudfit Walkup. 189.
Noah Webster's Pronunciation and Modern New England Speech: A Comparison. Karl-Erik Lindlad. Rev. by John B. Newman. 425.
On Aphasia. Sigmund Freud. Rev. by Paul C. Boomsliter. 81.
Oral Decision-Making. Waldo W. Braden and Earnest S. Brandenburg. Rev. by Harold P. Zelko. 192.
Pan-L-View on Parliamentary Procedure, designer Edward J. Ryan. Rev. by Irving J. Lee. 86.
Pastoral Preaching. David A. MacLennan. Rev. by F. Winston Jones. 435.
Philosophy and Analysis. Margaret Macdonald, ed. Rev. by William R. Gondin. 422.
Phonetic Alphabet, The. Frances A. Cartier. Rev. by R. S. Brubaker. 195.
Practical Public Speaking. Eugene E. White and Clair R. Henderlider. Rev. by John P. Highlander. 76.
Praised and Damned: The Story of Fulton Lewis, Jr. Booton Herndon. Rev. by John P. Highlander. 199.
Preaching the Word with Authority. Frederick W. Schroeder. Rev. by William H. Bos. 433.
Preface to Drama: An Introduction to Dramatic Literature and Theatre Art. Charles W. Cooper. Rev. by Reginald V. Holland. 323.
President's Words, The: Volume I, Eisenhower. Elsie De Graff Shoemaker and Ralph J. Shoemaker. Rev. by Hollis L. White. 327.
Principles of Theatre Art. H. D. Albright, William P. Halstead, and Lee Mitchell. Rev. by Hubert Heffner. 426.
Process and Effects of Mass Communication, The. Wilbur Schramm, ed. Rev. by Kenneth Harwood. 205.
Psalms in Rhythmic Prose, The. James A. Kleist and Thomas J. Lynam, transs. Rev. by E. Winston Jones. 200.
Public Opinion and Propaganda: A Book of Readings. Daniel Katz, Dorwin Cartwright, Samuel Eldersveld, and Alfred McClung Lee, eds. Rev. by Robert T. Oliver. 81.
Reading Aloud Effectively. Ben Graf Henneke. Rev. by John Robson. 193.
Readings from Dickens. Emlyn Williams. Rev. by Theresa and Richard Murphy. 78.
Renunciation as a Tragic Focus. Eugene H. Falk. Rev. by John T. Dugan. 190.
Rhetoric at Rome: A Historical Survey. M. L. Clarke. Rev. by Kenneth W. Pauli. 202.
Robert M. LaFollette. Fola and Belle Case La-Follette. Rev. by Carroll P. Lahman. 418.
Shakespeare: Of an Age and for All Time. Charles Tyler Prouty, ed. Rev. by E. J. West. 87.
Shakespeare Survey 8. Allardyce Nicoll, ed. Rev. by Albert Gilman. 318.
Shakspere and Common Sense. Edwin R. Hunter. Rev. by Ray Irwin. 317.
Social Ideas of the Northern Evangelists, 1826-1860, The. Charles C. Cole, Jr. Rev. by Paul H. Boase. 69.
Social Science in Medicine. Leo W. Simmons and Harold G. Wolff. Rev. by Elwood Murray. 83.
Social Sciences in Historical Study, The. Hugh G. J. Aitken, ed. Rev. by Douglas Ehninger. 75.
Sophists, The. Mario Untersteiner. Rev. by Otis M. Walter. 325.
South in American Literature, The: 1607-1900. Jay B. Hubbell. Rev. by Guy A. Cardwell. 182.
Speaking for the Master. Batsell Barrett Baxter. Rev. by Charles A. McGlon. 435.
Speaking in the Church. John Edward Lantz. Rev. by William H. Bos. 433.
Speech: Code, Meaning, and Communication. John W. Black and Wilbur E. Moore. Rev. by J. Calvin Callaghan. 430.
Speech Communication. William Norwood Brigance. Rev. by Victor M. Powell. 327.
Speech, Debate, Drama in Contests and Festivals. William S. Howell, Donald K. Smith, and David W. Thompson. Rev. by A. L. Thurman, Jr. 310.
Speech: Dynamic Communication. Milton Dickens. Rev. by Harold F. Harding. 193.
Speech Practice Book for Speech Improvement and Speech Correction. Gladys Brazie. Rev. by Ruth B. Manser. 88.
Speech Project and Drill Book. Le Roy T. Laase. Rev. by Roy F. Hudson. 328.
Staging TV Programs and Commercials. Robert J. Wade. Rev. by Milan D. Barnes. 206.
Stormy Ben Butler. Robert S. Holzman. Rev. by Robert G. Gunderson. 71.
Strange Stories of Words. George F. Schott. Rev. by Robert W. Albright. 84.
Studies in Motivation. David C. McClelland, ed. Rev. by William S. Howell. 309.
Suggestions for Contest Speaking. Anne Louise Hirt. Rev. by Elton Abernathy. 86.
Swift's Rhetorical Art: A Study in Structure and Meaning. Martin Price. Rev. by James J. Murphy. 307.
Syllabus of Stage Lighting, A. Stanley McCandless. Rev. by Willard Bellman. 88.

Teaching of Modern Languages, The. Secretariat of UNESCO. Rev. by Harold B. Allen. 421.
Techniques of Television Production. Rudy Bretz. Rev. by Willard Bellman. 199.
Television Commercial, The. Harry Wayne McMahan. Rev. by Leo Martin. 79.
Television Program Production. Carroll O'Meara. Rev. by Joseph H. North. 432.
Theatre Annual, 1954, The. Blanche A. Corwin, ed. Rev. by Herbert L. Smith. 87.
Theatre '54. John Chapman, ed. Rev. by Elizabeth G. Scanlan. 320.
Theatre in Our Times, The. John Gassner. Rev. by Jonathan Curvin. 183.
Theatrical Lighting Practice. Joel Rubin and Lee Watson. Rev. by Willard Bellman. 324.
Theatrical Public in the Time of Garrick, The. Harry William Pedicord. Rev. by Albert E. Johnson. 187.
This is Educational Television. William Kenneth Cumming. Rev. by Martha Boyer. 315.
Three Lincoln Masterpieces. Benjamin Barondess. Rev. by H. F. Harding. 327.
Tragedies of George Chapman, The. Ennis Rees. Rev. by Pat M. Ryan, Jr. 204.
Tragicomedy. Marvin T. Herrick. Rev. by Albert E. Johnson. 427.
Twelve Americans Speak. John E. Pomfret, ed. Rev. by Wilbur Samuel Howell. 179.
Voice of Neurosis, The. Paul J. Moses. Rev. by Paul C. Boomsliter. 195.
Westminster Pulpit, The: The Preaching of G. Campbell Morgan. G. C. Morgan. Rev. by Thomas H. Marsh. 84.
Who Speaks for God? Gerald Kennedy. Rev. by E. Winston Jones. 435.
William Ellery Channing. David P. Edgell. Rev. by Marie Hochmuth. 415.
William Freeman Vilas: Doctrinaire Democrat. Horace Samuel Merrill. Rev. by Frederick W. Haberman. 71.
William Lloyd Garrison and the Humanitarian Reformers. Russel B. Nye. Rev. by Robert G. Gunderson. 417.
William Poel and the Elizabethan Revival. Robert Speaight. Rev. by Pat M. Ryan, Jr. 429.
Woman's Labor Leader. Agnes Nestor. Rev. by Bess Sondel. 72.
Words We Use, The. J. A. Sheard. Rev. by Robert W. Albright. 83.
Workbook in Descriptive Linguistics. H. A. Gleason, Jr. Rev. by Robert W. Albright. 423.
Yankee Reformers in the Urban Age. Arthur Mann. Rev. by Ernest J. Wrage. 301.
Young Sam Johnson. James L. Clifford. Rev. by Donald J. Winslow. 305.

THE FORUM

Budgets Submitted by Finance Committee and Approved by Executive Council at 1954 Convention. The Forum. 173.
Irving J. Lee. Wilbur S. Howell. The Forum. 284.
New Constitution for SAA. The Forum. 284.
Notices of Intent to Organize Interest Groups. The Forum. 294.
Notices of Intent to Organize Interest Groups. The Forum. 407.
Observations on "Communication Primer," A Film. Murray Fowler. The Forum. 407.
Presentation of the Speech Education Volume. Karl R. Wallace. The Forum. 62.
QJS and *SM:* A Problem in Boundaries, The. Wilbur S. Howell. The Forum. 61.
Report of the Committee Appointed to Nominate an Editor for the *QJS*. The Forum. 296.
Speech Association of America. Excerpts from the Minutes of the Executive Council. The Forum. 169.
What is New in the Speech Association of America? Magdalene Kramer. The Forum. 403.